Communications in Mathematical Physics manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

Tight asymptotic bounds on local hypothesis testing between a pure bipartite state and the white noise state

Masahito Hayashi[1,2], **Masaki Owari**[3]

[1] Graduate School of Mathematics, Nagoya University, Japan.
[2] Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, Singapore.
[3] NTT Communication Science Laboratories, NTT Corporation 3-1,Morinosato Wakamiya Atsugi-Shi, Kanagawa, 243-0198, Japan

Received:

Abstract: We consider asymptotic hypothesis testing (or state discrimination with asymmetric treatment of errors) between an arbitrary fixed bipartite pure state $|\Psi\rangle$ and the completely mixed state under one-way LOCC (local operations and classical communications), two-way LOCC, and separable POVMs. As a result, we derive the Hoeffding bounds under two-way LOCC POVMs and separable POVMs. Further, we derive a Stein's lemma type of optimal error exponents under one-way LOCC, two-way LOCC, and separable POVMs up to the third order, which clarifies the difference between one-way and two-way LOCC POVM. Our study gives a very rare example in which the optimal performance under the infinite-round two-way LOCC is also equal to that under separable operations and can be attained with two-round communication, but not attained with the one-way LOCC.

arXiv:1409.3897v3 [quant-ph] 11 Apr 2015

1. Introduction

When a distant bipartite system is given as two parties, Alice and Bob, it is natural to restrict their operations to local operation and classical communication (LOCC) [57] because it is not so easy to realize a quantum operation across both of the distant parties. LOCC operations can be classified by the direction of classical communication. When the direction of classical communication is restricted to only one direction, the LOCC operation is called a one-way LOCC. Otherwise, it is called a two-way LOCC. Although a one-way LOCC operation requires only one-round classical communication, a two-way LOCC operation does multiple-round classical communication. In this case, a two-way LOCC protocol with k-round classical communication has $k+1$ steps. For example, in the case of two-round classical communication, the total protocol is given as follows when the initial operation is done by Alice: Alice performs her operation

with her measurement and sends her outcome to Bob. Bob receives Alice's outcome, performs his operation with his measurement, and sends his outcome to Alice. Alice then receives Bob's outcome and performs her measurement.

To consider the relation between accessible information and these kinds of restrictions on the operations, state discrimination with LOCC restriction for our measurement [1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24, 25,26,27,28,29,30] has been widely studied. In this paper, we focus on hypothesis testing (state discrimination with asymmetric treatment of errors) of a pair of quantum states. When our operations are limited to one-way LOCC operations or two-way LOCC operations, hypothesis testing is called local hypothesis testing. If we do not impose any constraint on our measurement, a general asymptotic theory can be established even for the quantum case when multiple copies of the unknown states are available. For example, Hiai et al. [51] and Ogawa et al. [48] derived the quantum version of Stein's bound [37], i.e., the optimal exponent of the type-2 error under the constant constraint for the type-1 error. Audenaert et al. [33] and Nussbaum et al. [43] derived the quantum version of the Chernoff bound [37], i.e., the optimal exponent of the sum of the type-1 and type-2 errors. Other papers [34,42] derived the quantum version of the Hoeffding bound [44,49,50], which is the optimal exponent of the type-2 error under the exponential constraint for the type-1 error and can be considered to be a generalization of the Chernoff bound. However, when we impose the one-way or two-way LOCC constraint on our measurement, these problems become very difficult, and they have not been solved completely. In particular, it is quite difficult to solve these problems for an arbitrary fixed pair of quantum states. In the following, we mainly address Hoeffding bounds and will hardly mention about the Chernoff bounds. This treatment does not lose the generality because our results about the Hoeffding bounds includes the results bound the Chernoff bounds as special cases.

To avoid the difficulty caused by generality, this paper discusses the problem of distinguishing an arbitrary fixed pure entangled state $|\Psi\rangle$ from the white noise state, i.e., the completely mixed state. In the non-asymptotic setting, our previous paper [15] addressed the problem under the constraint that $|\Psi\rangle$ is detected with probability 1. Our more recent paper [36] addressed it in a more general setting. In particular, that paper [36] proposed concrete two-round classical communication two-way LOCC protocols that are not reduced to one-way LOCC. Then, we extended the problem to the case when the entangled state is given as the n-copy state of a certain entangled state [38]. As asymptotic results, we showed that there is no difference between one-way and two-way LOCC for Stein's bound, i.e., the optimal exponent of the type-2 error under the constant constraint for the type-1 error. To make an upperbound of the optimal performance of the two-way LOCC case, our papers [15,36,38] also considered the performance in the case of separable operations, which can be easily treated because of their mathematically simple forms. The class of separable operations includes LOCC, but there exist separable operations which are not LOCC [3].

However, our previous paper [38] did not derive the Hoeffding bound for two-way LOCC, i.e., the optimal exponent of the type-2 error under the exponential constraint for the type-1 error, while it derived it for one-way LOCC. Further, even under the constant constraint for the type-1 error, the paper did not consider the higher order of the decreasing rate of the type-2 error. Indeed,

in information theory, Strassen [41] derived the decreasing rate of the type-2 error up to the third-order $\log n$ under the same constraint in the classical setting when n is the number of available copies. Tomamichel et al [46] and Li [45] extended this result up to the second order $\sqrt{n}$.

In this paper, we derive the Hoeffding bound for two-way LOCC and the optimal decreasing rate of the type-2 error under the constant constraint for the type-1 error up to the third-order $\log n$ for one-way and two-way LOCC. We also derive them for separable measurements. The obtained results are summarized as follows.

(1) There is a difference in the Hoeffding bound between the one-way and two-way LOCC constraints unless the entangled state $|\Psi\rangle$ is maximally entangled.
(2) There is no difference in the Hoeffding bound between two-way LOCC and separable constraints.
(3) The optimal decreasing rate of the type-2 error under the constant constraint for the type-1 error has no difference between the one-way and two-way LOCC constraints up to the second order $\sqrt{n}$.
(4) The optimal decreasing rate of the type-2 error under the constant constraint for the type-1 error has a difference between the one-way and two-way LOCC constraints in the third order $\log n$ unless the entangled state $|\Psi\rangle$ is maximally entangled.
(5) The optimal decreasing rate of the type-2 error under the constant constraint for the type-1 error is not different between the two-way LOCC and separable constraints up to the third order $\log n$.
(6) The three-step two-way LOCC protocol proposed in [36] can achieve the Hoeffding bound for two-way LOCC.
(7) The three-step two-way LOCC protocol proposed in [36] can achieve the optimal decreasing rate of the type-2 error under the constant constraint for the type-1 error up to the third-order $\log n$ for two-way LOCC.

Finally, we discuss our result from the mathematical point of view. The difficulty of the above results can be classified into two parts. One is the asymptotic evaluation of optimal performance of separable operations. The other is the asymptotic evaluation of optimal performance of the three-step two-way LOCC protocol proposed in [36]. Usually, to evaluate the exponential decreasing rate, we employ large deviation theory, e.g., Cramér Theorem. However, to evaluate the exponential decreasing rates in the former case, we need more detailed analysis. Hence, we employ the strong large deviation initiated by Bhadur-Rao [63], which enables us to analyze the tail probability up to the constant order of exponentially small probability. (See Proposition 7 in Appendix.) Indeed, although Bhadur-Rao [63] obtained such detailed evaluation for the tail probability in 1960, they were rarely applied to information theoretical topics. That is, our analysis is a good application of the strong large deviation. On the other hand, to evaluate the exponential decreasing rates in the latter case, we employ the type method [47], the saddle point approximation [62, 61].

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we summarize the known results for simple hypothesis testing and explain the main results by preparing the mathematical descriptions of our hypothesis testing problem. Then, we derive the analytical expressions of the optimal error exponents under one-way LOCC POVMs in Section 3. Next, in Section 4, we derive the analytical expressions

of the optimal error exponents under separable LOCC POVMs. For this derivation, we discuss a specific composite hypothesis testing by using the strong large deviation [63]. In Section 5, we analyze a special class of two-round classical communication LOCC (thus, two-way LOCC) protons for this local hypothesis testing problem by using the type method [47] and the saddle point approximation [62,61]. Finally, we summarize the results of our paper in Section 6. Our notation is the same as in our previous paper [38]. It therefore might be helpful for readers to refer to the list of notations given in the appendix of [38]. In Appendix A, we summarize the basic knowledge for the strong large deviation [63].

2. Preliminary and main results

2.1. Preliminary I: General quantum hypothesis testing. This paper mainly treats hypothesis testing in a bipartite quantum system and its n-copies extension. For this purpose, we firstly discuss hypothesis testing in a general quantum system $\mathcal{H}$ and its n-copies extension. In quantum hypothesis testing, we consider two hypotheses, the null hypothesis and the alternative hypothesis. When a hypothesis consists of one element, it is called simple. Otherwise, it is called composite. This paper mainly addresses simple hypotheses, but it discusses a composite hypothesis partially. Here, we assume that the null hypothesis is a state ρ and the alternative hypothesis is state σ. In the n-copies setting, the quantum system is given by $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$. Then, the null and alternative hypotheses are the states $\rho^{\otimes n}$ and $\sigma^{\otimes n}$. Our decision is given by a two-valued POVM consisting of two POVM elements T_n and $I^n - T_n$, where I^n is the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ and T_n is an positive-semi definite operator on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$. When the measurement outcome corresponds to T_n, we judge an unknown state as $\sigma^{\otimes n}$, and when the measurement outcome is $I^n - T_n$, we judge it as $\rho^{\otimes n}$.

Thus, type-1 error is written as

$$\alpha_n(T_n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Tr}\rho^{\otimes n} T_n, \tag{1}$$

and type-2 error is written as

$$\beta_n(T_n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Tr}\sigma^{\otimes n} \left(I^n - T_n\right). \tag{2}$$

The optimal type-2 error under the condition that the type-1 error is no more than a constant $\alpha \ge 0$ is written as

$$\beta_n(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{T_n} \left\{\beta_n(T_n) \mid \alpha_n(T_n) \le \alpha, I^n \ge T_n \ge 0\right\}. \tag{3}$$

Now, we give the asymptotic properties of $\beta_n(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$. For this purpose, we introduce the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the standard normal distribution $\Phi(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{-\infty}^{x} \frac{e^{-y^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dy$, the quantum relative entropy $D(\rho\|\sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Tr}\rho(\log\rho - \log\sigma)$, and the quantities $V(\rho\|\sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Tr}\rho(\log\rho - \log\sigma - D(\rho\|\sigma))^2$,

and $\psi(s|\rho\|\sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\log \mathrm{Tr}\rho^{1-s}\sigma^s$. Then, we have the asymptotic expansions [41, 44, 49, 50]

$$\log \beta_n(\epsilon|\rho\|\sigma) = -nD(\rho\|\sigma) - \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\rho\|\sigma)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon) + O(\log n) \tag{4}$$

$$\log \beta_n(e^{-nr}|\rho\|\sigma) = -n \sup_{0\le s<1} \frac{\psi(s|\sigma\|\rho) - sr}{1-s} + o(n). \tag{5}$$

when $V(\rho\|\sigma) > 0$. Expansions (4) and (5) are called the Stein-Strassen and the Hoeffding expansions, respectively.

When ρ and σ are commutative with each other, we have the more detailed expansion

$$\log \beta_n(\epsilon|\rho\|\sigma) = -nD(\rho\|\sigma) - \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\rho\|\sigma)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon) - \frac{1}{2}\log n + O(1). \tag{6}$$

2.2. Preliminary II: Known results of local hypothesis testing. Now, we proceed to the hypothesis testing on a bipartite quantum system and its n-copies extension, which is the main topic of this paper. A single copy of a bipartite Hilbert space is written as $\mathcal{H}_{AB} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, and its local dimensions are written as $d_A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dim \mathcal{H}_A$ and $d_B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dim \mathcal{H}_B$. We use notations like I_A, I_B, I_{AB}, I_A^n, I_B^n, and I_{AB}^n for identity operations on $\mathcal{H}_A$, $\mathcal{H}_B$, $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$, $\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes n}$, $\mathcal{H}_B^{\otimes n}$, and $\mathcal{H}_{AB}^{\otimes n}$, respectively. When it is easy to identify the domain of an identity operator, we abbreviate them to I hereafter.

In this paper, we define d as

$$d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min(d_A, d_B), \tag{7}$$

and consider asymptotic hypothesis testing between n-copies of an arbitrary known pure-bipartite state $|\Psi\rangle$ with the Schmidt decomposition as

$$|\Psi\rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \sqrt{\lambda_i}|i\rangle \otimes |i\rangle, \tag{8}$$

and n-copies of the completely mixed state (or the white noise)

$$\rho_{mix} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{I_{AB}}{d_A d_B} \tag{9}$$

under the various restrictions on available POVMs: global POVMs, separable POVMs, one-way LOCC POVMs, and two-way LOCC POVMs [56, 57]. We choose the completely mixed state $\rho_{mix}^{\otimes n}$ as a null hypothesis and the state $|\Psi\rangle^{\otimes n}$ as an alternative hypothesis.

As variants of $\beta_n(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$, the optimal type-2 error under the condition that the type-1 error is no more than a constant $\alpha \ge 0$ is written as

$$\beta_{n,C}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{T_n} \{\beta_n(T_n) \mid \alpha_n(T_n) \le \alpha, \{T_n, I - T_n\} \in C\}, \tag{10}$$

where C is either $\to$, $\leftrightarrow$, Sep, and g corresponding to classes of one-way LOCC, two-way LOCC, separable and global POVMs, respectively. Here, we note that

although $\to$, Sep, and g are compact sets, $\leftrightarrow$ is not compact by its original definition [52]. Further, we denote the class of two-way LOCCs with k-round classical communication by $\leftrightarrow, k$. In this notation, $\leftrightarrow, 1$ is equivalent to $\to$.

Hence, in this paper, the class $\leftrightarrow$ is defined as a closure of the set of all two-way LOCC POVMS, which involves infinite-step LOCC protocols as well [3,25, 53,54,55]. This definition of the class $\leftrightarrow$ justifies the use of min in Eq.(10) for $C = \leftrightarrow$. In the global POVMs g, since

$$\log \beta_{n,g}(\epsilon|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}) = -n \log d_A d_B + \log(1-\epsilon), \tag{11}$$

as is shown in [38], we have

$$\beta_{n,g}(\epsilon|\rho_{mix}\|\Psi) = 0 \tag{12}$$
$$\beta_{n,g}(e^{-nr}|\rho_{mix}\|\Psi) = 0 \text{ with } r \in [0, \log d_A d_B] \tag{13}$$
$$\beta_{n,g}(e^{-nr}|\rho_{mix}\|\Psi) = 1 \text{ with } r \in (\log d_A d_B, +\infty), \tag{14}$$

and the following expansions

$$\begin{aligned}\log \beta_{n,g}(e^{-nr}|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}) &= -n \log d_A d_B + \log(1-e^{-nr}) \\ &= -n \log d_A d_B - e^{-nr} + o(e^{-nr}).\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

To discuss the remaining cases, we introduce the Rényi entropy $H_{1-s}(\Psi)$ of the reduced density of the entangled state $|\Psi\rangle$ and its derivative as follows.

$$H_{1-s}(\Psi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\log \sum_i \lambda_i^{1-s}}{s}, \quad H'_\alpha(\Psi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{d}{d\alpha} H_\alpha(\Psi) \tag{16}$$

and $H_1(\Psi)$ is defined as the limit $\lim_{s\to 0} H_{1-s}(\Psi)$. By the Rényi entropy $H_{1-s}(\Psi)$, the entropy of the entanglement $E(|\Psi\rangle)$, the Schmidt rank $R_S(|\Psi\rangle)$ [56,57], and the logarithmic robustness of entanglement $LR(|\Psi\rangle)$ [58,59,60] are characterized as

$$E(|\Psi\rangle) = H_1(\Psi), \ \log R_S(|\Psi\rangle) = H_0(\Psi), \ LR(|\Psi\rangle) = H_{1/2}(\Psi). \tag{17}$$

In the following, for the unified treatment, we only use the notation $H_{1-s}(\Psi)$. We also prepare the quantity $V(\Psi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_i \lambda_i (\log \lambda_i + H_1(\Psi))^2$.

Then, our previous paper [38] shows the following propositions. The Stein bounds are given as follows.

Proposition 1. *[38, Theorem 2] For a given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a sufficiently large number N such that*

$$\beta_{n,\to}(\epsilon|\rho_{mix}\|\Psi) = \beta_{n,\leftrightarrow}(\epsilon|\rho_{mix}\|\Psi) = \beta_{n,sep}(\epsilon|\rho_{mix}\|\Psi) = 0 \tag{18}$$

for $n \ge N$. Further, for a given $\epsilon > 0$, we have the following expansion.

$$\log \beta_{n,\to}(\epsilon|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}) = -n(\log d_A d_B - H_1(\Psi)) + o(n), \tag{19}$$
$$\begin{aligned}\log \beta_{n,\leftrightarrow}(\epsilon|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}) &= \log \beta_{n,sep}(\epsilon|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}) + o(n) \\ &= -n(\log d_A d_B - H_1(\Psi)) + o(n).\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

The Hoeffding bounds are characterized as follows.

Proposition 2. *[38, (40) and (110)] We have the following relation.*

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\to}(r|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}) &\stackrel{\rm def}{=} \lim_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_{n,\to}\left(e^{-nr}|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}\right) \\ &= \sup_{0\le s<1} \frac{-s}{1-s} r - H_s(\Psi) + \log d_A d_B. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

This relation implies the following equation for $r \ge r_{\to} \stackrel{\rm def}{=} -H_0'(\Psi)$*:*

$$H_{\to}(r|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}) = \log d_A d_B - H_0(\Psi). \tag{22}$$

Further, when $r \ge \log d_A d_B - H_{1/2}(\Psi)$*, we have*

$$H_{sep}(r|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \lim_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_{n,sep}\left(e^{-nr}|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}\right) = \log d_A d_B - H_{1/2}(\Psi). \tag{23}$$

2.3. Main results. In this subsection, we give a short description of the main results of this paper. As a refinement of Proposition 1, we obtain the following theorem for Stein-Strassen bounds.

Define the function $\Phi(x) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \int_{-\infty}^{x} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{\frac{x^2-y^2}{2}} dy$. Let d be the lattice span for the distribution given by the Schmidt coefficient of Ψ.

Theorem 1. *For a given* $\epsilon > 0$*, we have the following expansions.*

$$\begin{aligned} &\log\beta_{n,\to}(\epsilon|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}) \\ =& -n(\log d_A d_B - H_1(\Psi)) - \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon) - \frac{1}{2}\log n + O(1), \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\log\beta_{n,\leftrightarrow,2}(\epsilon|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}) = \log\beta_{n,\leftrightarrow}(\epsilon|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}) + O(1) \\ =& \log\beta_{n,sep}(\epsilon|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}) + O(1) \\ =& -n(\log d_A d_B - H_1(\Psi)) - \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon) - \log n + O(1). \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Relations (24) and (25) show that the difference between $\log\beta_{n,\to}(\epsilon|\Psi\|\rho_{mix})$ and $\log\beta_{n,\leftrightarrow}(\epsilon|\Psi\|\rho_{mix})$ exists only on the order of $\log n$.

For the Hoeffding bounds of two-way LOCC and separable cases, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 2.

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_{n,\leftrightarrow,2}\left(e^{-nr}|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}\right) = \lim_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_{n,\leftrightarrow}\left(e^{-nr}|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}\right) \\ =& \lim_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_{n,sep}\left(e^{-nr}|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}\right) \\ =& \sup_{0\le s<1} \frac{-2s}{1-s} r - H_{\frac{1+s}{2}}(\Psi) + \log d_A d_B. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

This theorem concludes that the Chernoff bound for the two-way LOCC case equals that for the separable case, which was an open problem in the previous paper [38].

Since $H_{\frac{1+s}{2}}(\Psi)$ monotonically decreases for s, the supremum $\sup_{0\le s<1} \frac{-2s}{1-s} r - H_{\frac{1+s}{2}}(\Psi) + \log d_A d_B$ is realized with $s \to 0$ when $r \ge r_\leftrightarrow \stackrel{\rm def}{=} -\frac{1}{4} H'_{1/2}(\Psi)$. In this case, the Hoeffding bounds for two-way LOCC and separable cases coincide with the right hand side of (23). Since the convexity of $sH_{1+s}(\Psi)$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\log d - H_{\frac{1}{2}}(\Psi) \ge H_0(\Psi) - H_{\frac{1}{2}}(\Psi) \\
=&\frac{1}{2} \frac{\frac{-1}{2} H_{1-\frac{1}{2}}(\Psi) - (-H_{1-1}(\Psi))}{-\frac{-1}{2} - (-1)} - \frac{1}{2} H_{\frac{1}{2}}(\Psi) \\
=&\frac{1}{2} \frac{d s H_{1+s}(\Psi)}{ds}\Big|_{s=-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{2} H_{\frac{1}{2}}(\Psi) = -\frac{1}{4} H'_{1/2}(\Psi),
\end{aligned}$$

this argument can be regarded as an extension of (23) in Proposition 2.

The right hand sides of (21) and (26) are numerically calculated as shown in Figs. 1 and 2 when the pure entangled state $|\Psi\rangle$ is given as a pure state $|\Psi(\lambda)\rangle$:

$$|\Psi(\lambda)\rangle = \sqrt{\lambda} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d-1} |ii\rangle \right) + \sqrt{1-(d-1)\lambda} |dd\rangle, \tag{27}$$

where λ satisfies $0 \le \lambda \le 1/\sqrt{d}$. The graphs in Figs. 1 and 2 show the typical points $r_\rightarrow$ and $r_\leftrightarrow$ on the horizontal line and $\log d_A d_B - H_0(\Psi)$, $\log d_A d_B - H_{1/2}(\Psi)$, and $\log d_A d_B - H_1(\Psi)$ on the vertical line. Note that $|\Psi(0)\rangle$ is a product state and $|\Psi(1/\sqrt{d})\rangle$ is a maximally entangled state. The results in Figs. 1 and 2 show that two-way LOCC improves the Hoeffding bound when r is large.

3. Hypothesis testing under one-way LOCC POVMs

In this section, we consider $C = \rightarrow$, that is, the local hypothesis testing under one-way LOCC POVMs. In this case, we focus on the state

$$\sigma_\Psi \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|, \tag{28}$$

where $\{|i\rangle \otimes |j\rangle\}_{i,j}$ is the Schmidt basis of $|\Psi\rangle$ [see Eq.(8)]. Then, our hypothesis testing is reduced to that with states σ_Ψ and ρ_{mix}. That is, the last paper [38] showed the following lemma:

Proposition 3. *Lemma 1 of [38] For all $\alpha > 0$, we have*

$$\beta_{n,\rightarrow}(\alpha|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}) = \beta_n(\alpha|\sigma_\Psi\|\rho_{mix}), \tag{29}$$

where the optimal type-2 error probability $\beta_{n,\rightarrow}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$ is defined by Eq. (10).



Fig. 2. Comparison of Hoeffding bounds in one-way LOCC and two-way LOCC when $d = 4$ and $\lambda = 0.05$. In this case, we have $r_{\rightarrow} = 0.911$, $r_{\leftrightarrow} = 0.212$, $\log d_A d_B - H_0(\Psi) = 1.386$, $\log d_A d_B - H_{1/2}(\Psi) = 1.841$, and $\log d_A d_B - H_1(\Psi) = 2.185$.

Since

$$D(\Psi\|\rho_{mix}) = \log d_A d_B - H_1(\Psi), \quad V(\Psi\|\rho_{mix}) = V(\Psi), \tag{30}$$

$$\psi(s|\rho_{mix}\|\Psi) = (1-s)(H_s(\Psi) - \log d_A d_B), \tag{31}$$

by applying (6) to the commutative states $\rho = \rho_{mix}$ and $\sigma = \sigma_\Psi$, Proposition 3 yields (24). Similarly, applying (5), Proposition 3 reproduces the existing result (21). Therefore, we obtain the results for the one-way LOCC case.

4. Hypothesis testing under separable POVM

4.1. Hypothesis testing with a composite hypothesis.

4.1.1. Non-asymptotic analysis. In this subsection, in order to consider hypothesis testing under separable POVM for a pure state $|\varphi\rangle \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{p_i}|i\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d$, we consider a specific composite hypothesis testing on $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$ as follows. Here, we assume that the distribution $p = (p_i)$ is not uniform. The following type of composite hypothesis testing plays a key role in our analysis of our hypothesis testing in the bipartite system. The null hypothesis is given as the pure state $|\varphi\rangle^{\otimes n}$ in the n-tensor product system $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$. To give the alternative hypothesis, we introduce a notation. In the quantum system $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$, the basis $|i_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |i_n\rangle$ is simplified to $|J\rangle$ by using $J \in \{1, \ldots, d\}^n$. Hence, the quantum system $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$ is spanned by $\{|J\rangle\}_{J \in \mathcal{D}^n} = \{|i_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |i_n\rangle\}_{i_1,\ldots,i_n}$, where $\mathcal{D}^n \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \{1, \ldots, d\}^n$. Then, the alternative hypothesis $\mathcal{S}_{n,0}$ is a set of states $\{|\phi_L^n\rangle\}_{L \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{d^n}}$, where $|\phi_L^n\rangle \in \left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)^{\otimes n}$ is defined as

$$|\phi_L^n\rangle \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \sqrt{\frac{1}{d^n}} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}^n} (-1)^{L_J} |J\rangle, \quad L \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{d^n}, \tag{32}$$

where L_J is a Jth element of $L \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{d^n}$.

For a two-valued POVM $\{S_n, I - S_n\}$ on $\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)^{\otimes n}$, the type-1 error $\alpha_n(S_n)$ and type-2 error $\beta_n(S_n)$ are defined as

$$\alpha_n(S_n) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} {\rm Tr} S_n |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|^{\otimes n} \tag{33}$$

$$\beta_n(S_n) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}_{n,0}} {\rm Tr}(I_d^n - S_n)\rho, \tag{34}$$

where I_d^n is an identity operator on $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$. The optimal type-2 error under the restriction on the condition that the type-1 error is no more than $\alpha \ge 0$ can be written as

$$\beta_n(\alpha|\varphi) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \min_{0 \le S_n \le I_d^n} \{\beta_n(S_n) | \alpha_n(S_n) \le \alpha\}. \tag{35}$$

Similarly, we define $\alpha_n(\beta|\varphi)$ as

$$\alpha_n(\beta|\varphi) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \min_{0 \le S_n \le I_d^n} \{\alpha_n(S_n) | \beta_n(S_n) \le \beta\}. \tag{36}$$

In the rest of this subsection, we often abbreviate $\beta_n(\alpha|\varphi)$ as $\beta_n(\alpha)$.

Now, we define the subset $S_n(R) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \{J \in \mathcal{D}^n | \log p_J^n \ge nR\}$ of $\mathcal{D}^n$, where $p_J^n := p_{i_1} \cdots p_{i_n}$ for $J = (i_1, \ldots, i_n)$. Then, we define the normalized vector $|\varphi_n(R)\rangle \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \sum_J \varphi_{n,J}(R)|J\rangle$ as

$$\varphi_{n,J}(R) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{p_J^n}{p^n(S_n(R))}} & \text{if } J \in S_n(R) \\ 0 & \text{if } J \notin S_n(R). \end{cases} \tag{37}$$

We also employ the notations $a_n(R) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} 1 - |\langle \varphi_n(R)|\varphi\rangle^{\otimes n}|^2$ and $b_n(R) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} |\langle \varphi_n(R)|\phi_0^n\rangle|^2$. We also employ the following notations:

$$P_{n,1}(R) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \sum_{J\in S_n(R)} p_J^n, \quad P_{n,1/2}(R) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \sum_{J\in S_n(R)} \sqrt{p_J^n}, \quad P_{n,0}(R) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} |S_n(R)|$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &a_n(R,R') \\ \stackrel{\rm def}{=}& 1 - \frac{\left(\frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)P_{n,1/2}(R')}{P_{n,0}(R)} + \left(P_{n,1}(R') - \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R')^2}{P_{n,0}(R)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(P_{n,1}(R) - \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)^2}{P_{n,0}(R)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^2}{P_{n,1}(R')}. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Then, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 4 (Theorem 4 of [36]). *Given R', we choose the minimum R satisfying*

$$e^{-\frac{nR}{2}} \ge \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)}{P_{n,0}(R)}\left(1 - \left(\frac{\frac{P_{n,1}(R)P_{n,0}(R)}{P_{n,1/2}(R)^2} - 1}{\frac{P_{n,1}(R')P_{n,0}(R)}{P_{n,1/2}(R')^2} - 1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right), \tag{39}$$

and we choose the maximum $\tilde{R}$ satisfying

$$e^{-\frac{n\tilde{R}}{2}} < \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)}{P_{n,0}(\tilde{R})}\left(1 - \left(\frac{\frac{P_{n,1}(\tilde{R})P_{n,0}(\tilde{R})}{P_{n,1/2}(\tilde{R})^2} - 1}{\frac{P_{n,1}(R')P_{n,0}(\tilde{R})}{P_{n,1/2}(R')^2} - 1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right). \tag{40}$$

Then, we have

$$a_n(\tilde{R},R') < \alpha_n\left(\frac{P_{n,1/2}(R')^2}{d^n P_{n,1}(R')}\middle|\varphi\right) \le a_n(R,R'). \tag{41}$$

Proof: Proposition 4 is straight forward from Theorem 4 of [36]. However, since our notations are different from those in Theorem 4 of [36], giving the derivation from Theorem 4 of [36] to Proposition 4 is helpful for readers. We give the derivation as follows. In this proof, we employ the notations given in [36]. For example, we use the notations $u_l := (\sqrt{\lambda_1}, \ldots, \sqrt{\lambda_l})$ and $v_l := \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}(1, \ldots, 1)$, etc.

To show the second inequality of (41), we consider only the case when $l = |S_n(R)| = P_{n,0}(R)$, $l' = P_{n,0}(R')$, and $\epsilon^2 = \frac{u_{l'}\cdot v_{l'}}{\|u_{l'}\|} = \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R')^2}{d^n P_{n,1}(R')}$. Note that $l' \le l$. Then, $u_l \cdot v_l = \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)}{d^{n/2}}$, $\|v_l\|^2 = \frac{P_{n,0}(R)}{d^n}$, and $\|u_l\|^2 = \frac{P_{n,1}(R)}{d^n}$. Since the distribution p is not uniform, we do not need to consider Case B2) in Theorem 4 of [36]. If we allow $u_\eta \cdot v_\eta = \epsilon\|u_\eta\|$ in B3), B1) can be regarded as a part of B3) because the RHS of (60) for B1) coincides with that for B3) with $c_\eta = \epsilon$.

As shown latter, all entries of

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{x}(u_l, v_l, \epsilon)\\ :=&\frac{1}{\sqrt{\|u_l\|^2\|v_l\|^2 - u_l\cdot v_l}}(\sqrt{\|v_l\|^2-\epsilon^2}u_l\\ &+\frac{\epsilon\sqrt{\|u_l|^2\|v_l\|^2 - cu_l\cdot v_l} - u_l\cdot v_l\sqrt{\|v_l\|^2-\epsilon^2}}{\|v_l\|^2}v_l)\end{aligned}$$

are non-negative if and only if Condition (39) holds. Hence, in this case, we see that $l \le \eta$ and that the vector $\hat{x}(u_l, v_l, \epsilon)$ is the same as the vector $x^*(u_l, v_l, \epsilon)$ defined in (55) of [36]. Thus,

$$1-\alpha_n(\epsilon|\varphi) \ge \langle\psi|x^*(u_l, v_l, \epsilon)\rangle \tag{42}$$

$$\begin{aligned}=&\frac{(u_l\cdot v_l\epsilon + \sqrt{(\|v_l\|^2-\epsilon^2)(\|v_l\|^2\|u_l\|^2 - u_l\cdot v_l^2)})^2}{\|v_l\|^4}\\ =&\frac{\left(\frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)}{d^{n/2}}\frac{P_{n,1/2}(R')}{d^{n/2}P_{n,1}(R')^{1/2}} + \sqrt{(\frac{P_{n,0}(R)}{d^n} - \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R')^2}{d^nP_{n,1}(R')})(\frac{P_{n,0}(R)P_{n,1}(R)}{d^n} - \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)^2}{d^n})}\right)^2}{\frac{P_{n,0}(R)^2}{d^{2n}}}\\ =&\frac{\left(\frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)P_{n,1/2}(R')}{P_{n,0}(R)} + \left(P_{n,1}(R') - \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R')^2}{P_{n,0}(R)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(P_{n,1}(R) - \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)^2}{P_{n,0}(R)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^2}{P_{n,1}(R')},\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

which implies the second inequality of (41).

The remaining task is to show that all entries of $\hat{x}(u_l, v_l, \epsilon)$ are non-negative if and only if Condition (39) holds. The above non-negativity is equivalent to the non-negativity of the l-th entry of $x^*(u_l, v_l, \epsilon)$, which is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}0 \le&\sqrt{\|v_l\|^2-\epsilon}\sqrt{p_l} + \frac{\epsilon\sqrt{\|u_l\|^2\|v_l\|^2 - u_l\cdot v_l^2} - u_l\cdot v_l\sqrt{\|v_l\|^2-\epsilon^2}}{\|v_l\|^2}\frac{1}{d^{n/2}}\\ =&\sqrt{\|v_l\|^2-\epsilon}\left(\sqrt{p_l} + \frac{u_l\cdot v_l}{\|v_l\|^2}\left(\frac{\sqrt{\frac{\|u_l\|^2\|v_l\|^2}{u_l\cdot v_l^2}}-1}{\sqrt{\frac{\|v_l\|^2}{\epsilon^2}}-1}-1\right)\frac{1}{d^{n/2}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

This condition is equivalent to

$$\sqrt{p_l} \ge \frac{u_l\cdot v_l}{d^{n/2}\|v_l\|^2}\left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{\frac{\|u_l\|^2\|v_l\|^2}{u_l\cdot v_l^2}}-1}{\sqrt{\frac{\|v_l\|^2}{\epsilon^2}}-1}\right). \tag{44}$$

Substituting the above correspondence, we obtain the equivalence between Condition (39) and the non-negativity of all entries of $\hat{x}(u_l, v_l, \epsilon)$.

To show the first inequality of (41), we choose $l = P_{n,0}(R)$ and other parameters in the same way. Due to Lemma 9 of [36], $\hat{x}(u_l, v_l, \epsilon)$ is the solution of the following minimum value:

$$\max\{\langle u_l|\phi\rangle^2 || \phi\rangle \in \mathbb{R}^l, \|\phi\|^2 = 1, \langle u_l|\phi\rangle \le \epsilon,\}, \tag{45}$$

which equals

$$\frac{(u_l \cdot v_l \epsilon + \sqrt{(\|v_l\|^2 - \epsilon^2)(\|v_l\|^2 \|u_l\|^2 - u_l \cdot v_l^2)})^2}{\|v_l\|^4}. \tag{46}$$

Due to the above equivalence, we have $l > \eta$. Since the vector $\hat{x}(u_\eta, v_\eta, \epsilon)$ attains the minimum $X_\epsilon(|\psi\rangle)$ given in [36, (49)], the minimum $X_\epsilon(|\psi\rangle)$ can be converted, via [36, (50) in Lemma 8], to

$$\max\{\langle u_l|\phi\rangle^2 || \phi\rangle \in \mathbb{R}^l, \|\phi\|^2 = 1, \langle u_l|\phi\rangle \le \epsilon, 1 \le \forall i \le l\}. \tag{47}$$

As the vector $\hat{x}(u_\eta, v_\eta, \epsilon)$ is different from $\hat{x}(u_l, v_l, \epsilon)$, the minimum $X_\epsilon(|\psi\rangle)$ is strictly smaller than (46), which is equivalent to

$$1 - \alpha_n(\epsilon|\varphi) < \frac{(u_l \cdot v_l \epsilon + \sqrt{(\|v_l\|^2 - \epsilon^2)(\|v_l\|^2 \|u_l\|^2 - u_l \cdot v_l^2)})^2}{\|v_l\|^4}.$$

Hence, combining the same discussion, we obtain the first inequality of (41).

Note that we cannot derive the tight evaluation of $\alpha_n\left(\frac{P_{n,1/2}(R')^2}{d^n P_{n,1}(R')}\middle|\varphi\right)$ because our choice of l is limited to $l = |S_n(R)| = P_{n,0}(R)$. We obtain lower and upper bounds as (41). ■

Using $P^c_{n,1}(R) := 1 - P_{n,1}(R)$, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 1.

$$P^c_{n,1}(R) \le a_n(R, R') \le P^c_{n,1}(R'). \tag{48}$$

Proof: To show Lemma 1, we will show the following.

$$P_{n,1}(R') \le 1 - a_n(R, R') \le P_{n,1}(R). \tag{49}$$

First, we show the second inequality of (49). Since

$$\frac{P_{n,1/2}(R')^2}{P_{n,0}(R)P_{n,1}(R')} + \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)^2}{P_{n,0}(R)P_{n,1}(R)} \ge 2\Big(\frac{P_{n,1/2}(R')^2}{P_{n,0}(R)P_{n,1}(R')} \cdot \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)^2}{P_{n,0}(R)P_{n,1}(R)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
$$= 2\frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)P_{n,1/2}(R')}{P_{n,0}(R)P_{n,1}(R)^{\frac{1}{2}}P_{n,1}(R')^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

we have

$$\Big(1 - \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R')^2}{P_{n,0}(R)P_{n,1}(R')}\Big)\Big(1 - \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)^2}{P_{n,0}(R)P_{n,1}(R)}\Big)$$
$$\le \Big(1 - \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)P_{n,1/2}(R')}{P_{n,0}(R)P_{n,1}(R)^{\frac{1}{2}}P_{n,1}(R')^{\frac{1}{2}}}\Big)^2,$$

i.e.,

$$\Big(1 - \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R')^2}{P_{n,0}(R)P_{n,1}(R')}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big(1 - \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)^2}{P_{n,0}(R)P_{n,1}(R)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
$$\le 1 - \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)P_{n,1/2}(R')}{P_{n,0}(R)P_{n,1}(R)^{\frac{1}{2}}P_{n,1}(R')^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\left(\frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)P_{n,1/2}(R')}{P_{n,0}(R)}+\left(P_{n,1}(R')-\frac{P_{n,1/2}(R')^2}{P_{n,0}(R)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(P_{n,1}(R)-\frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)^2}{P_{n,0}(R)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^2}{P_{n,1}(R')}\\
=&P_{n,1}(R)\left(\frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)P_{n,1/2}(R')}{P_{n,0}(R)P_{n,1/2}(R)^{\frac{1}{2}}P_{n,1/2}(R')^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right.\\
&\qquad\left.+\left(1-\frac{P_{n,1/2}(R')^2}{P_{n,0}(R)P_{n,1}(R')}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(1-\frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)^2}{P_{n,0}(R)P_{n,1}(R)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^2\\
\le&P_{n,1}(R)\left(\frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)P_{n,1/2}(R')}{P_{n,0}(R)P_{n,1/2}(R)^{\frac{1}{2}}P_{n,1/2}(R')^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right.\\
&\qquad\left.+1-\frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)P_{n,1/2}(R')}{P_{n,0}(R)P_{n,1}(R)^{\frac{1}{2}}P_{n,1}(R')^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)^2\\
=&P_{n,1}(R).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we obtain the second inequality of (49).

To show the first inequality of (49), we recall Lemma 9 of [36]. Here, we employ the notation given in Theorem 4 of [36]. We apply Lemma 9 of [36] to the case when $y = u_l$, $z = v_l$, and $\epsilon = \frac{u_{l'}\cdot v_{l'}}{\|u_{l'}\|}$ with $l' \le l$. Then, we find that $x = \frac{u_{l'}}{\|u_{l'}\|}$ satisfies the condition in $M(u_l, v_l, \epsilon)$ given in (53) of [36]. Then, Lemma 9 of [36] guarantees that

$$\|u_{l'}\| = u_l \cdot \frac{u_{l'}}{\|u_{l'}\|} \le \frac{u_l \cdot v_l \epsilon + \sqrt{(\|v_l\|^2 - \epsilon^2)(\|v_l\|^2\|u_l\|^2 - u_l \cdot v_l^2)}}{\|v_l\|^2}, \tag{50}$$

which implies

$$\|u_{l'}\|^2 \le \left(\frac{u_l \cdot v_l \epsilon + \sqrt{(\|v_l\|^2 - \epsilon^2)(\|v_l\|^2\|u_l\|^2 - u_l \cdot v_l^2)}}{\|v_l\|^2}\right)^2. \tag{51}$$

Apply (51) to the case when $l = |S_n(R)| = P_{n,0}(R)$ and $l' = |S_n(R')| = P_{n,0}(R')$. Then, using $\|u_{l'}\|^2 = P_{n,1}(R')$ and the equations in (43), we obtain the first inequality of (49). ■

4.1.2. Constant constraint for type-1 error. Under a constant constraint for type-1 error, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *We have*

$$\log \beta_n(\epsilon|\varphi) = n(H(p) - \log d) - \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(p)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon) - \log n + O(1), \tag{52}$$

where $V(p) := \sum_i p_i (H(p) + \log p_i)^2$.

Proof: First, we define the function

$$g(d) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \begin{cases} -\log 2 & \text{if } d=0 \\ \log \frac{1-e^{-\frac{1}{2}d}}{1-e^{-d}} & \text{if } d>0. \end{cases} \tag{53}$$

Here, d is the lattice span of the random variable $-\log p_i$ under the distribution p. For the precise definition of d, see Appendix A.

To show this theorem, we consider the case when $R = -H(p) + \frac{A}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{B}{n}$ and $R' = -H(p) + \frac{A}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{B'}{n}$. As shown later, when

$$B' = B + 2\log(1 - e^{g(d)}) + o(1), \tag{54}$$

the equality in (39) holds in an asymptotic sense. More precisely,

$$(1+o(1))e^{-\frac{nR}{2}} = \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)}{P_{n,0}(R)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{\frac{P_{n,1}(R)P_{n,0}(R)}{P_{n,1/2}(R)^2} - 1}{\frac{P_{n,1}(R')P_{n,0}(R)}{P_{n,1/2}(R')^2} - 1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right). \tag{55}$$

There exist two sequences of constants C_n and $\tilde{C}_n$ such that

$$e^{-\frac{nR}{2}} \ge \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)}{P_{n,0}(R)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{\frac{P_{n,1}(R)P_{n,0}(R)}{P_{n,1/2}(R)^2} - 1}{\frac{P_{n,1}(R'+\frac{C_n}{n})P_{n,0}(R)}{P_{n,1/2}(R'+\frac{C_n}{n})^2} - 1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \tag{56}$$

$$e^{-\frac{nR}{2}} < \frac{P_{n,1/2}(R)}{P_{n,0}(R)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{\frac{P_{n,1}(R)P_{n,0}(R)}{P_{n,1/2}(R)^2} - 1}{\frac{P_{n,1}(R'+\frac{\tilde{C}_n}{n})P_{n,0}(R)}{P_{n,1/2}(R'+\frac{\tilde{C}_n}{n})^2} - 1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right). \tag{57}$$

Hence, Proposition 4 yields that

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_n \left(\frac{P_{n,1/2}(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}})^2}{d^n P_{n,1}(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}})} \right) \\ =& a_n(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{-2\log(1-e^{g(d)})+o(1)}{n}, -H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}}) \Big| \varphi, \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{P_{n,1/2}(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}})^2}{d^n P_{n,1}(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}})} \\ =& \beta_n \left(a_n(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{-2\log(1-e^{g(d)})+o(1)}{n}, -H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}}) \Big| \varphi \right). \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

As shown later,

$$a_n(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{-2\log(1-e^{g(d)})+o(1)}{n}, -H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}}) = \Phi(A) + o(1) \tag{60}$$

$$\log \frac{P_{n,1/2}(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}})^2}{d^n P_{n,1}(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}})} = n(H(p) - \log d) - \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(p)}A - \log n + O(1). \tag{61}$$

Then, we obtain (52).

Now, under Condition (54), we show the following equality equivalent to the asymptotic equality of (39):

$$\frac{P_{n,0}(R)}{P_{n,1/2}(R)}e^{-\frac{nR}{2}} = \left(1 - \left(\frac{\frac{P_{n,1}(R)P_{n,0}(R)}{P_{n,1/2}(R)^2} - 1}{\frac{P_{n,1}(R')P_{n,0}(R)}{P_{n,1/2}(R')^2} - 1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)(1+o(1)). \tag{62}$$

For this purpose, we apply Proposition 7 in Appendix. When the distribution p in Proposition 7 is the measure $\{p_i\}_i$ and X is $\log p_i$, we denote the functions given in Proposition 7 by adding superscript 1, like χ_0^1, $\tau^1(s)$, etc. Similarly, when the distribution p in Proposition 7 is the measure $\{\sqrt{p_i}\}_i$ (the counting measure) and X is $\log p_i$ We denote them by adding superscript 1/2 (0). We also employ the function $\psi_p(s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \log \sum_i p_i^{1+s}$. Then, we have

$$\tau^1(s) = \psi_p(s), \quad \tau^{1/2}(s) = \psi_p(s-\frac{1}{2}), \quad \tau^0(s) = \psi_p(s-1) \tag{63}$$

$$\eta^1(R) = {\psi'_p}^{-1}(R), \quad \eta^{1/2}(R) = {\psi'_p}^{-1}(R) + \frac{1}{2}, \quad \eta^0(R) = {\psi'_p}^{-1}(R) + 1. \tag{64}$$

Hence,

$$\eta^{1\prime}(R) = \eta^{1/2\prime}(R) = \eta^{0\prime}(R) = \frac{1}{\psi''_p({\psi'_p}^{-1}(R))} \tag{65}$$

$$\chi_0^0(R) = -R({\psi'_p}^{-1}(R)+1) + \psi_p({\psi'_p}^{-1}(R)) \tag{66}$$

$$\chi_0^{1/2}(R) = -R({\psi'_p}^{-1}(R)+\frac{1}{2}) + \psi_p({\psi'_p}^{-1}(R)) \tag{67}$$

$$\chi_0^{0\prime}(R) = -{\psi'_p}^{-1}(R) - 1 \tag{68}$$

$$\chi_0^{1/2\prime}(R) = -{\psi'_p}^{-1}(R) - \frac{1}{2} \tag{69}$$

$$\chi_0^{0\prime\prime}(R) = \chi_0^{1/2\prime\prime}(R) = -\frac{d{\psi'_p}^{-1}}{dR}(R) = -\frac{1}{\psi''_p({\psi'_p}^{-1}(R))}. \tag{70}$$

$$h_1(R) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \chi_1^0(R) - \chi_1^{1/2}(R) = \begin{cases} \log \frac{{\psi'_p}^{-1}(R)+\frac{1}{2}}{{\psi'_p}^{-1}(R)+1} & \text{if } d=0 \\ \log \frac{1-e^{-({\psi'_p}^{-1}(R)+\frac{1}{2})d}}{1-e^{-({\psi'_p}^{-1}(R)+1)d}} & \text{if } d>0. \end{cases} \tag{71}$$

In particular,

$$h_1(-H(p)) = g(d). \tag{72}$$

Generally, Proposition 7 implies that

$$\log \frac{P_{n,0}(R)}{P_{n,1/2}(R)}e^{-\frac{nR}{2}} = h_1(R) \tag{73}$$

$$\log P_{n,1/2}(R) = n(-R({\psi'_p}^{-1}(-R)+\frac{1}{2}) + \psi_p({\psi'_p}^{-1}(-R)) - \frac{1}{2}\log n + O(1)$$

$$\log P_{n,0}(R) = n(-R({\psi'_p}^{-1}(-R)+1) + \psi_p({\psi'_p}^{-1}(-R)) - \frac{1}{2}\log n + O(1).$$

Thus, we have

$$\log \frac{P_{n,0}(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}}+\frac{B}{n})}{P_{n,1/2}(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}}+\frac{B}{n})^2}$$
$$=\frac{1}{2}\log n+\frac{1}{\psi_p''(0)}\frac{A^2}{2}+\chi_1^0(-H(p))-2\chi_1^{1/2}(-H(p))+O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}) \quad (74)$$
$$\log \frac{P_{n,0}(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}}+\frac{B}{n})}{P_{n,1/2}(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}}+\frac{B'}{n})^2}$$
$$=\frac{1}{2}\log n+\frac{1}{\psi_p''(0)}\frac{A^2}{2}+\chi_1^0(-H(p))-2\chi_1^{1/2}(-H(p))+B-B'+O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}) \quad (75)$$
$$\log \frac{P_{n,0}(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}})}{P_{n,1/2}(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}})}e^{-\frac{n(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}})}{2}}=g(d) \quad (76)$$
$$\log P_{n,1}(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}})=n\frac{H(p)}{2}-\sqrt{n}A-\frac{1}{2}\log n+O(1) \quad (77)$$
$$\log P_{n,1/2}(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}})=n\frac{H(p)}{2}-\sqrt{n}\frac{A}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\log n+O(1). \quad (78)$$

The central limit theorem yields

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P_{n,1}(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}}+\frac{B'}{n})=\lim_{n\to\infty} P_{n,1}(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}}+\frac{B}{n})$$
$$=1-\Phi(\frac{A}{\sqrt{V(p)}})=\Phi(-\frac{A}{\sqrt{V(p)}}). \quad (79)$$

Remember that Φ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard Gaussian distribution. Then, (76) guarantees that LHS of (62) goes to $e^{g(d)}$, and (74), (75), and (79) do that RHS of (62) goes to

$$1-\sqrt{\frac{\Phi(-\frac{A}{\sqrt{V(p)}})}{\Phi(-\frac{A}{\sqrt{V(p)}})}e^{B'-B}}. \quad (80)$$

Since (54) implies

$$(1-e^{g(d)})^2=e^{B'-B}+o(1), \quad (81)$$

we have

$$e^{g(d)}=1-\sqrt{e^{B'-B}}+o(1). \quad (82)$$

Therefore, we can conclude that the equality (54) holds under the condition (54).

Finally, we show (60) and (61). Lemma 1 and (79) yield (60), and (77) and (78) yield

$$\log \frac{P_{n,1/2}(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}})^2}{d^n P_{n,1}(-H(p)+\frac{A}{\sqrt{n}})}=n(H(p)-\log d)-\sqrt{n}A-\log n+O(1), \quad (83)$$

which implies (61). ■

4.1.3. Exponential constraint.

Theorem 4.

$$\log \beta_n(e^{-nr}|\varphi) = n(2 \min_{0\le s<1} (\frac{s}{1-s} r + \frac{1}{2} H_{\frac{1+s}{2}}(p)) - \log d) + o(n). \tag{84}$$

Proof: Given r, we choose $R(r)$ such that

$$-r = \chi_0^1(-R(r)). \tag{85}$$

To show this theorem, we consider the case when $R = -R(r) + \frac{B}{n}$ and $R' = -R(r) + \frac{B'}{n}$. In this case, as shown later, the equality in (39) holds in the asymptotic sense when $B' = B + \frac{\log 1 - e^{h_1(-R(r))} + o(1)}{\chi_0^{1/2'}(-R(r))} + o(1)$. Since $B + \frac{\log 1 - e^{h_1(-R(r))} + o(1)}{\chi_0^{1/2'}(-R(r))}$ is monotonically increasing for B, due to Proposition 4,

$$\frac{P_{n,1/2}(-R(r))^2}{d^n P_{n,1}(-R(r))} = \beta_n \left(a_n(-R(r) + \frac{-\frac{\log 1 - e^{h_1(-R(r))} + o(1)}{\chi_0^{1/2'}(-R(r))} + o(1)}{n}, -R(r)) \middle| \varphi \right).$$

As shown later,

$$a_n(-R(r) + \frac{-2\log(1 - e^{g(d)}) + o(1)}{n}, -R(r)) = r \tag{86}$$

$$\log \frac{P_{n,1/2}(-H(p) + \frac{A}{\sqrt{n}})^2}{d^n P_{n,1}(-H(p) + \frac{A}{\sqrt{n}})} = n(2 \min_{0\le s<1} (\frac{s}{1-s} r + \frac{1}{2} H_{\frac{1+s}{2}}(p)) - \log d) + o(n) \tag{87}$$

Then, we obtain (84).

Now, we show that the equality in (39) holds in the asymptotic sense when $B' = B + \frac{\log 1 - e^{h_1(-R(r))} + o(1)}{\chi_0^{1/2'}(-R(r))} + o(1)$. Using the notations in Subsection 4.1.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\log \frac{P_{n,0}(-R(r) + \frac{B}{n})}{P_{n,1/2}(-R(r) + \frac{B}{n})^2} \\
=&\chi_0^1(-R(r))n + \frac{1}{2}\log n + \chi_1^0(-R(r)) - 2\chi_1^{1/2}(-R(r)) \\
&\qquad + (\chi_0^{0'}(-R(r)) - 2\chi_0^{1/2'}(-R(r)))B + o(1), \\
&\log \frac{P_{n,0}(-R(r) + \frac{B}{n})}{P_{n,1/2}(-R(r) + \frac{B'}{n})^2} \\
=&\chi_0^1(-R(r))n + \frac{1}{2}\log n + \chi_1^0(-R(r)) - 2\chi_1^{1/2}(-R(r)) \\
&\qquad + \chi_0^{0'}(-R(r))B - 2\chi_0^{1/2'}(-R(r))B' + o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\log \frac{P_{n,0}(-R(r) + \frac{B}{n})}{P_{n,1/2}(-R(r) + \frac{B}{n})} e^{-\frac{n(-R(r) + \frac{B}{n})}{2}} = h_1(-R(r)) + o(1).$$

Then, the LHS of (39) is $e^{h_1(-R(r))}+o(1)$, and the RHS of (39) is $1-e^{\chi_0^{1/2'}(-R(r))(B'-B)}$. Hence, when $B' = B + \frac{\log 1-e^{h_1(-R(r))}+o(1)}{\chi_0^{1/2'}(-R(r))} + o(1)$, the equality in (39) holds in the asymptotic sense.

From Condition (85) and Proposition 7, we have

$$-r = \chi_0^1(-R(r)) = R(r){\psi'_p}^{-1}(-R(r)) + \psi_p(({\psi'_p}^{-1}(-R(r))) = R(r)t_0 + \psi_p(t_0)$$

where $\psi'_p(t_0) = -R(r)$. Thus,

$$-r = -t_0\psi'_p(t_0) + \psi_p(t_0), \tag{88}$$

which implies that $\frac{d}{dt}\frac{2t-1}{2t}r - \frac{\psi_p(t)}{2t}|_{t=t_0} = 0$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\chi_0^{1/2}(-R(r)) = R(r)({\psi'_p}^{-1}(-R(r)) + \frac{1}{2}) + \psi_p({\psi'_p}^{-1}(-R(r))) = \frac{R(r)}{2} - r \\
=& -\frac{2t_0+1}{2t_0}r - \frac{\psi_p(t_0)}{2t_0} = \min_{t\le 0} -\frac{2t+1}{2t}r - \frac{\psi_p(t)}{2t} \\
=& \min_{t\le 0} -\frac{2t+1}{2t}r + \frac{H_{1+t}(p)}{2} = \min_{0\le s<1} \frac{s}{1-s}r + \frac{1}{2}H_{\frac{1+s}{2}}(p),
\end{aligned}$$

where $t = -\frac{1-s}{2}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\log \frac{P_{n,1/2}(-R(r))^2}{d^n P_{n,1}(-R(r))} = n(2\chi_0^{1/2}(-R(r)) - \log d) + o(n) \\
=& n(2\min_{0\le s<1}(\frac{s}{1-s}r + \frac{1}{2}H_{\frac{1+s}{2}}(p)) - \log d) + o(n),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies (87). Proposition 7 and (85) imply that

$$\log(1 - P_{n,1}(-R(r))) = -rn - \frac{1}{2}\log n + O(1) \tag{89}$$

$$\log(1 - P_{n,1}(-R(r) + \frac{B}{n})) = -rn - \frac{1}{2}\log n + O(1) \tag{90}$$

Thus, Lemma 1 implies (86). ■

4.2. Application to hypothesis testing under separable POVMs. Now, we choose the dimension $d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min(d_A, d_B)$ and the pure state $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\lambda_i}|i\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d$ by using the Schmidt coefficient $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^d$ of $|\Psi\rangle$. Then, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 5 (Theorem 5 of [36]).

$$\beta_{n,sep}(\alpha|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}) = d_{max}^{-n}\beta_n(\alpha|\varphi). \tag{91}$$

where d_{max} is defined as

$$d_{max} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max(d_A, d_B). \tag{92}$$

Combining (91) and Theorem 3, we find that $\beta_{n,sep}(\epsilon|\Psi\|\rho_{mix})$ can be given by (25) because $\log d + \log d_{max} = \log d_A d_B$. Similarly, combining (91) and Theorem 4, we find that $\beta_{n,sep}(e^{-nr}|\Psi\|\rho_{mix})$ can be given by (26).

5. Hypothesis testing under two-way LOCC POVM

5.1. Construction of two-round classical communication protocol. In this section, we consider $C = \leftrightarrow$, that is, the local hypothesis testing under two-way LOCC POVMs. In the previous paper [36], we proposed a specific class of two-round classical communication two-way LOCC protocols that are not reduced to one-way LOCC. In this subsection, we review their construction. Then, in the latter subsections, we show that they can achieve the Hoeffding bound and Stein-Strassen bound for the class $C = sep$.

For the state entangled state $|\tilde{\Psi}\rangle \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \sqrt{\lambda_x}|x\rangle\otimes|x\rangle$ and the completely mixed state ρ_{mix}, we denote the power set $\{0,1\}^{\mathcal{X}}$ of $\mathcal{X}$ by Ω, i.e., $\Omega \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \{\omega\}_{\omega\subset\mathcal{X}}$. Then, we choose a collection $\{m_\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}$ of non-negative measures on $\mathcal{X}$ satisfying $\sum_{\omega\in\Omega} m_\omega(x) \le 1$ for any $x\in\mathcal{X}$. Here, $\omega\in\Omega$ is an index indicating the measure m_ω. For a measure m_ω on $\mathcal{X}$, we denote the cardinality of the support of m_ω by $|m_\omega|$ and define the operator

$$M_\omega \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} m_\omega(x)|x\rangle\langle x|. \tag{93}$$

Then, for a collection $\{m_\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}$ of non-negative measures on $\mathcal{X}$, we define the operator

$$M^c \stackrel{\rm def}{=} I - \sum_{\omega\in\Omega} M_\omega. \tag{94}$$

Then, we can define the POVM $M \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \{M_\omega\}\cup\{M^c\}$. Using the collection $\{m_\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}$, we give a tree-step LOCC protocol to distinguish the two states $|\tilde{\Psi}\rangle$ and ρ_{mix} as follows:

1. Alice measures her state with a POVM M. When Alice's measurement outcome corresponds to M^c, Alice and Bob stop the protocol and conclude the unknown state to be ρ_{mix}. Otherwise, they continue the protocol.
2. At the second step, Bob measures his state with a POVM $\{N_j^\omega\}_{j=0}^{|m_\omega|}$ depending on Alice's measurement outcome ω. For $j\in\{1,\ldots,|m_\omega|\}$, N_j^ω is defined as $N_j^\omega = |\xi_j^\omega\rangle\langle\xi_j^\omega|$, where $\{|\xi_j^\omega\rangle\}_{j=1}^{|m_\omega|}$ is a mutually unbiased basis of the subspace $span\{|h\rangle\}_{h\in\omega}$. Then, N_0^ω is defined as $N_0^\omega \stackrel{\rm def}{=} I_B - \sum_{j=1}^{|m_\omega|} N_j^\omega$. When Bob observes the measurement outcome $j=0$, Alice and Bob stop the protocol and conclude the unknown state to be ρ_{mix}. Otherwise, they continue the protocol.
3. At the third step, Alice measures her states with a two-value POVM $\{O^{\omega j}, I_A - O^{\omega j}\}$. Here, the POVM element $O^{\omega j}$ is chosen as Alice's state after Bob's measurement when the given state is $|\tilde{\Psi}\rangle$. Hence, $O^{\omega j}$ is defined as

$$O^{\omega j} \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \frac{\sqrt{M_\omega\sigma_A}\left(|\xi_j^\omega\rangle\langle\xi_j^\omega|\right)^T\sqrt{M_\omega\sigma_A}}{\langle\xi_j^\omega|M_\omega\sigma_A|\xi_j^\omega\rangle}, \tag{95}$$

where $\sigma_A \stackrel{\rm def}{=} {\rm Tr}_B|\tilde{\Psi}\rangle\langle\tilde{\Psi}|$, and T is the transposition in the Schmidt basis of $|\tilde{\Psi}\rangle$. When Alice's measurement result k is 0, Alice and Bob conclude the unknown state to be $|\tilde{\Psi}\rangle$; otherwise, they conclude the unknown state to be ρ_{mix}.

Here, the above two-round classical communication protocol depends only on the collection $\{m_\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}$ of non-negative measures on $\mathcal{X}$. Hence, we denote the test given above by $T[\{m_\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}]$. Then, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 6 (Lemma 4 of [36]). *The first and type-2 error probabilities of the test $T[\{m_\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}]$ are evaluated as*

$$\beta(T[\{m_\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}]) = \mathrm{Tr} T[\{m_\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}]\rho_{mix} = \sum_{\omega\in\Omega} \frac{|m_\omega| \cdot \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \lambda_x (m_\omega(x))^2}{d_A d_B \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \lambda_x m_\omega(x)}, \quad (96)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(T[\{m_\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}]) =& \langle\tilde{\Psi}|(I - T[\{m_\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}])|\tilde{\Psi}\rangle = \mathrm{Tr}\mathrm{Tr}_B |\tilde{\Psi}\rangle\langle\tilde{\Psi}| M^c \\ =& 1 - \sum_{\omega\in\Omega}\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \lambda_x m_\omega(x). \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

In the above proposition, the type-1 and type-2 error probabilities are swapped to each other from Lemma 4 of [36].

5.2. Hoeffding bound. Now, we apply the above two-round classical communication protocol to the case of $|\tilde{\Psi}\rangle = |\Psi\rangle^{\otimes n}$ with $|\tilde{\Psi}\rangle \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \sqrt{\lambda_x}|x,x\rangle$. Then, we give a two-round classical communication protocol to achieve the Hoeffding bound $\sup_{0\le s<1} \frac{-2s}{1-s} r - H_{\frac{1+s}{2}}(\Psi) + \log d_A d_B$ for a given r as follows. When $r \ge \log d - \frac{1}{4} H_{1/2}(\Psi)'$, we have $\sup_{0\le s\le 1} \frac{-2sr}{1-s} - H_{\frac{1+s}{2}}(\Psi) + \log d_A d_B = \log d_A d_B - H_{1/2}$ Hence, it is enough to give the following two kinds of protocols: One is a protocol in which the exponential decreasing rates of the type-1 and type-2 errors are r and $\sup_{0\le s\le 1} \frac{-2sr}{1-s} - H_{\frac{1+s}{2}}(\Psi) + \log d_A d_B$ for $r < \log d - \frac{1}{4} H_{1/2}(\Psi)'$. The other is a protocol in which the type-1 error is zero and the exponential decreasing rate of the second kind of error probability is $\log d_A d_B - H_{1/2}$. Before constructing the protocols, we prepare the following lemma. Let P be a distribution (p_x) on $\mathcal{X}$ and $P_{1/2}$ be a measure $(p_x^{1/2})$ on $\mathcal{X}$.

Lemma 2. *For $r < \log d - \frac{1}{4} H_{1/2}(\Psi)'$, we have*

$$\min_{Q: D(Q\|P)\le r} D(Q\|P) - H(Q) = \sup_{0\le s<1} \frac{-2s}{1-s} r - H_{\frac{1+s}{2}}(\Psi). \quad (98)$$

In particular,

$$\min_Q D(Q\|P) - H(Q) = D(P_{1/2}\|P) - H(P_{1/2}) = -H_{1/2}(\Psi). \quad (99)$$

$$\min_{Q: D(Q\|P)=0} D(Q\|P) - H(Q) = -H_1(\Psi). \quad (100)$$

Using the above lemmas and the type method, we make the protocols as follows. For this purpose, we prepare notations for the type method. When an n-trial data $\boldsymbol{x}_n \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathcal{X}^n$ is given, we focus on the distribution $p(x) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \frac{\#\{i|x_i = x\}}{n}$, which is called the empirical distribution for data $\boldsymbol{x}_n$. In the type method, an empirical distribution is called a type. In the following, we denote the set of empirical distributions on $\mathcal{X}$ with n trials by $\mathcal{T}_n$. The

cardinality $|\mathcal{T}_n|$ is bounded by $(n+1)^{|\mathcal{X}|-1}$ [47], which increases polynomially with the number n. That is,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{T}_n| = 0. \tag{101}$$

This property is the key idea in the type method. When $T_n(Q)$ represents the set of n-trial data whose empirical distribution is Q, the cardinality $|T_n(Q)|$ can be evaluated as [47]

$$\lceil \frac{e^{nH(Q)}}{|\mathcal{T}_n|} \rceil \le |T_n(Q)| \le \lfloor e^{nH(Q)} \rfloor, \tag{102}$$

where $\lceil a \rceil$ is the minimum integer m satisfying $m \ge a$, and $\lfloor a \rfloor$ is the maximum m satisfying $m \le a$. Since any element $\boldsymbol{x} \in T_n(Q)$ satisfies

$$P^n(\boldsymbol{x}) := P(x_1) \cdots P(x_n) = e^{-n(D(Q\|P)+H(Q))}, \tag{103}$$

we obtain the important formula

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{T}_n|} e^{-nD(Q\|P)} \le P^n(T_n(Q)) \le e^{-nD(Q\|P)}. \tag{104}$$

Now, we are ready to mention the main theorem of this subsection.

Theorem 5. *For any $r < -\frac{1}{4} H_{1/2}(\Psi)'$ and n, there is a collection $\{m_{n,\omega}\}_\omega$ of non-negative measures on $\mathcal{X}^n$ such that*

$$\beta(T[\{m_{n,\omega}\}_\omega]) = \mathrm{Tr} T[\{m_{n,\omega}\}_\omega] \rho_{mix}^{\otimes n} \le 4|\mathcal{T}_n|^3 (d_A d_B)^{-n} e^{-n \sup_{0\le s<1} \frac{-2s}{1-s} r - H_{\frac{1+s}{2}}(\Psi)}, \tag{105}$$

$$\alpha(T[\{m_{n,\omega}\}_\omega]) = \langle \Psi^{\otimes n} | (I - T[\{m_{n,\omega}\}_\omega]) | \Psi^{\otimes n} \rangle \le |\mathcal{T}_n| e^{-nr}. \tag{106}$$

For any n, there is a collection $\{m_{n,\omega}\}_\omega$ of non-negative measures on $\mathcal{X}^n$ such that

$$\beta(T[\{m_{n,\omega}\}_\omega]) = \mathrm{Tr} T[\{m_{n,\omega}\}_\omega] \rho_{mix}^{\otimes n} \le 4|\mathcal{T}_n|^3 (d_A d_B)^{-n} e^{n H_{1/2}(\Psi)}, \tag{107}$$

$$\alpha(T[\{m_{n,\omega}\}_\omega]) = \langle \Psi^{\otimes n} | (I - T[\{m_{n,\omega}\}_\omega]) | \Psi^{\otimes n} \rangle = 0. \tag{108}$$

This theorem guarantees that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{-1}{n} \log \beta_{n,\leftrightarrow} \left(e^{-nr} |\Psi\|\rho_{mix} \right) \ge \sup_{0\le s<1} \frac{-2s}{1-s} r - H_{\frac{1+s}{2}}(\Psi) + \log d_A d_B. \tag{109}$$

Since $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{-1}{n} \log \beta_{n,\leftrightarrow} \left(e^{-nr} |\Psi\|\rho_{mix} \right) \le \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{-1}{n} \log \beta_{n,sep} \left(e^{-nr} |\Psi\|\rho_{mix} \right) = H_\leftrightarrow \left(r |\Psi\|\rho_{mix} \right)$, we obtain (26).

Construction of a collection of non-negative measures with $r < \log d - \frac{1}{4} H_{1/2}(\Psi)'$:

First, we consider the case of $r < \log d - \frac{1}{4} H_{1/2}(\Psi)'$. We choose a collection of

non-negative measures on $\mathcal{X}^n$ by employing the type method as follows. We give three disjoint subsets of types:

$$\mathcal{T}_{n,r} \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \{Q \in \mathcal{T}_n | -H(P) > D(Q\|P) - H(Q), D(Q\|P) \le r\},$$
$$\mathcal{T}'_n \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \{Q \in \mathcal{T}_n | -H(P) = -H_1(\Psi) \le D(Q\|P) - H(Q)\},$$
$$\mathcal{T}_{n,r,c} \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \{Q \in \mathcal{T}_n | -H(P) > D(Q\|P) - H(Q), D(Q\|P) > r\}.$$

We choose the element $P_n \in \mathcal{T}'_n$ that is closest to P among elements in $\mathcal{T}'_n$ in terms of relative entropy. We define the subset $\mathcal{T}''_n \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \mathcal{T}'_n \setminus \{P_n\}$.

Lemma 3. *Assume that n is sufficiently large. Then,*

$$D(P_n\|P) \le \frac{2d}{n} \tag{110}$$

Proof: We denote $P(i) - P_n(i)$ by $\delta_{n,i}$. Since n is sufficiently large, we have $-\log(1 + \frac{\delta_{n,i}}{P_n(i)}) \le -2\frac{\delta_{n,i}}{P_n(i)}$. Using the relation $|\delta_{n,i}| \le \frac{1}{n}$, we have

$$D(P_n\|P) = \sum_{i=1}^d P_n(i) \log \frac{P_n(i)}{P_n(i) + \delta_{n,i}} = -\sum_{i=1}^d P_n(i) \log(1 + \frac{\delta_{n,i}}{P_n(i)})$$
$$\le \sum_{i=1}^d P_n(i) - 2\frac{\delta_{n,i}}{P_n(i)} = -2\sum_{i=1}^d \delta_{n,i} \le \frac{2d}{n} \tag{111}$$

■

Then, we divide the set $T_n(P_n)$ into $|\mathcal{T}_{n,r}|$ disjoint sets $T_n(P_n)_Q$ ($Q \in \mathcal{T}_{n,r}$) whose cardinalities are $\lceil |T_n(P_n)|/|\mathcal{T}_{n,r}| \rceil$ or $\lfloor |T_n(P_n)|/|\mathcal{T}_{n,r}| \rfloor$. For a type $Q \in \mathcal{T}_{n,r}$, we divide the set $T_n(Q)$ into $\lceil |T_n(Q)|/|T_n(P_n)_Q| \rceil$ disjoint sets $T_n(Q)_1, \ldots, T_n(Q)_{\lceil |T_n(Q)|/|T_n(P_n)_Q| \rceil}$ whose cardinalities are less than $|T_n(P_n)_Q|$.

Hence, for $Q \in \mathcal{T}_{n,r}$, (104) yields

$$P^n(T_n(P_n)_Q) \ge \frac{e^{-nD(P_n\|P)}}{|\mathcal{T}_n| \cdot |\mathcal{T}_{n,r}|} \ge \frac{e^{-nD(P_n\|P)}}{|\mathcal{T}_n|^2}, \tag{112}$$

and (102) yields

$$|T_n(P_n)_Q| \le \lfloor e^{nH(P_n)} \rfloor \le \lfloor e^{nH(P)} \rfloor \le \lfloor e^{nH(Q)} \rfloor \tag{113}$$

For a subset $T_n(Q)$ with $Q \in \mathcal{T}''_n$, we define the non-negative measure $m_{Q,1}$ on $\mathcal{X}^n$ as

$$m_{Q,1}(\boldsymbol{x}) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } \boldsymbol{x} \in T_n(Q) \\ 0 \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{114}$$

For a subset $T_n(Q)_j$, we define the non-negative measure $m_{Q,j}$ on $\mathcal{X}^n$ as

$$m_{Q,j}(\boldsymbol{x}) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \boldsymbol{x} \in T_n(Q)_j \\ \lceil |T_n(Q)|/|T_n(P_n)_Q| \rceil^{-1} & \text{if } \boldsymbol{x} \in T_n(P_n)_Q \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{115}$$

Hence, the cardinality $|m_{Q,j}|$ is less than $2|T_n(P_n)_Q|$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P^n(\boldsymbol{x})(m_\omega(\boldsymbol{x}))^2 \\
=&\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in T_n(Q)_j} P^n(\boldsymbol{x})(m_\omega(\boldsymbol{x}))^2 + \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in T_n(P_n)_Q} P^n(\boldsymbol{x})\lceil |T_n(Q)|/|T_n(P_n)_Q|\rceil^{-2} \\
=&P^n(T_n(Q)_j) + P^n(T_n(P_n)_Q)\lceil |T_n(Q)|/|T_n(P_n)_Q|\rceil^{-2}, \qquad (116)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P^n(\boldsymbol{x})(m_\omega(\boldsymbol{x})) \\
=&\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in T_n(Q)_j} P^n(\boldsymbol{x})(m_\omega(\boldsymbol{x})) + \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in T_n(P_n)_Q} P^n(\boldsymbol{x})\lceil |T_n(Q)|/|T_n(P_n)_Q|\rceil^{-1} \\
=&P^n(T_n(Q)_j) + P^n(T_n(P_n)_Q)\lceil |T_n(Q)|/|T_n(P_n)_Q|\rceil^{-1} \\
\ge&P^n(T_n(P_n)_Q)\lceil |T_n(Q)|/|T_n(P_n)_Q|\rceil^{-1}. \qquad (117)
\end{aligned}$$

The above discussion gives the collection $\{m_{Q,j}\}_{Q,j}$ of non-negative measures on $\mathcal{X}^n$.

Proofs of (105) and (106): Now, we evaluate the two kinds of errors for the above collection of non-negative measures. The first kind of error probability is

evaluated as

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\beta(T[\{m_{Q,j}\}_{Q,j}]) = \mathrm{Tr} T[\{m_{Q,j}\}_{Q,j}]\rho_{mix}^{\otimes n} \\
&\overset{(a)}{\le} \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_{n,r}} \sum_j \frac{2|T_n(P_n)|\cdot \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P^n(\boldsymbol{x})(m_{Q,j}(x))^2}{d_A^n d_B^n \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} P^n(\boldsymbol{x}) m_{Q,j}(x)} + \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_n''} \frac{|T_n(Q)|}{d_A^n d_B^n} \\
&\le \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_{n,r}} \frac{2|T_n(P_n)_Q|\cdot \sum_j P^n(T_n(Q)_j) + P^n(T_n(P_n)_Q)\lceil |T_n(Q)|/|T_n(P_n)_Q|\rceil^{-2}}{d_A^n d_B^n P^n(T_n(P_n)_Q)\lceil |T_n(Q)|/|T_n(P_n)_Q|\rceil^{-1}} \\
&\quad + \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_n''} \frac{|T_n(Q)|}{d_A^n d_B^n} \\
&= \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_{n,r}} \frac{2|T_n(P_n)_Q|\cdot P^n(T_n(Q)) + P^n(T_n(P_n)_Q)\lceil |T_n(Q)|/|T_n(P_n)_Q|\rceil^{-1}}{d_A^n d_B^n P^n(T_n(P_n)_Q)\lceil |T_n(Q)|/|T_n(P_n)_Q|\rceil^{-1}} \\
&\quad + \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_n''} \frac{|T_n(Q)|}{d_A^n d_B^n} \\
&= \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_{n,r}} \frac{2|T_n(P_n)_Q|\cdot P^n(T_n(Q))}{d_A^n d_B^n P^n(T_n(P_n)_Q)\lceil |T_n(Q)|/|T_n(P_n)_Q|\rceil^{-1}} \\
&\quad + \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_{n,r}} \frac{2|T_n(P_n)_Q|}{d_A^n d_B^n} + \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_n''} \frac{|T_n(Q)|}{d_A^n d_B^n} \\
&= \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_{n,r}} \frac{2|T_n(P_n)_Q|\cdot P^n(T_n(Q))}{d_A^n d_B^n P^n(T_n(P_n)_Q)\lceil |T_n(Q)|/|T_n(P_n)_Q|\rceil^{-1}} + \frac{2|T_n(P_n)|}{d_A^n d_B^n} \\
&\quad + \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_n''} \frac{|T_n(Q)|}{d_A^n d_B^n} \\
&\le \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_{n,r}} \frac{2|T_n(P_n)_Q|\cdot (1+|T_n(Q)|/|T_n(P_n)_Q|)\cdot P^n(T_n(Q))}{d_A^n d_B^n P^n(T_n(P_n)_Q)} + (|\mathcal{T}_n'|+1)\frac{e^{nH(P)}}{d_A^n d_B^n} \\
&= \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_{n,r}} \frac{2(|T_n(Q)|+|T_n(P_n)_Q|)\cdot P^n(T_n(Q))}{d_A^n d_B^n P^n(T_n(P_n)_Q)} + (|\mathcal{T}_n'|+1)\frac{e^{nH(P)}}{d_A^n d_B^n} \\
&\overset{(b)}{\le} \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_{n,r}} \frac{2d\cdot 4|\mathcal{T}_n|^2 e^{n(H(Q)-D(Q\|P))}}{d_A^n d_B^n} + 2|\mathcal{T}_n'|\frac{e^{nH(P)}}{d_A^n d_B^n} \\
&\overset{(c)}{\le} \frac{8d|\mathcal{T}_n|^3 e^{-n(\min_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_{n,r}} D(Q\|P)-H(Q))}}{d_A^n d_B^n} \overset{(d)}{\le} 8d|\mathcal{T}_n|^3 e^{-n\sup_{0\le s<1}\frac{-2s}{1-s}r - H_{\frac{1+s}{2}}(\Psi)},
\end{aligned}
\tag{118}
$$

where (a) follows from (116) and (117), (b) follows from (112), (113), (104), and Lemma 3, and (c) follows from the inequality $\min_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_{n,r}} D(Q\|P) - H(Q)) \le -H_1(\Psi) \le \min_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_n''} D(Q\|P) - H(Q))$.

The second kind of error probability is evaluated as

$$\alpha(T[\{m_{Q,j}\}]) = \langle \Psi^{\otimes n}|(I - T[\{m_{Q,j}\}])|\Psi^{\otimes n}\rangle = \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_{n,r,c}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in T_n(Q)} P^n(\boldsymbol{x})$$

$$= \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_{n,r,c}} P^n(T_n(Q)) \overset{(a)}{\le} |\mathcal{T}_n| e^{-n \min_{Q\in\mathcal{T}_{n,r,c}} D(Q\|P)} \le |\mathcal{T}_n| e^{-nr}, \tag{119}$$

where (a) follows from (104).

Construction of another type of collection of non-negative measures: Next, we consider the case of $r = \log d_A d_B - H_{1/2}(\Psi)$. In this case, we change the definitions of the three disjoint subsets $\mathcal{T}_{n,r}$, $\mathcal{T}'_n$, and $\mathcal{T}_{n,r,c}$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}_{n,r} &\overset{\text{def}}{=} \{Q \in \mathcal{T}_n | -H(P) > D(Q\|P) - H(Q)\},\\
\mathcal{T}'_n &\overset{\text{def}}{=} \{Q \in \mathcal{T}_n | -H(P) = -H_1(\Psi) \le D(Q\|P) - H(Q)\},\\
\mathcal{T}_{n,r,c} &\overset{\text{def}}{=} \emptyset.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, using the same discussion as the above, we define the collection $\{m_{Q,j}\}_{Q,j}$ of non-negative measures on $\mathcal{X}^n$ in the same way.

Proofs of (107) and (108): Trivially, we have (108). As shown latter (in Lemma 5),

$$\min_Q D(Q\|P) - H(Q) = D(P_{1/2}\|P) - H(P_{1/2}) = -H_{1/2}(\Psi). \tag{120}$$

Even in this modification, (118) still holds except for (d). Instead of (d), we use (120). Then, we have (107).

5.3. Proof of Lemma 2. Now, we show Lemma 2. For θ, we define the distribution P_θ as

$$P_\theta(x) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{P^{1-\theta}(x)}{\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} P^{1-\theta}(x)}. \tag{121}$$

Then, for $r < -H_1(\Psi)$, we define $\theta(r) \in (0, 1]$ as

$$D(P_{\theta(r)}\|P) = r. \tag{122}$$

Lemma 4. *For $r < -H_1(\Psi)$, we have*

$$D(P_{\theta(r)}\|P) - H(P_{\theta(r)}) = \sup_{0\le s<1} \frac{-2s}{1-s} r - H_{\frac{1+s}{2}}(\Psi) \tag{123}$$

Proof: Define the function $\varphi(\theta) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \log \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} P^{1-\theta}(x)$. Since $\varphi''(\theta) > 0$, the function $\varphi(\theta)$ is strictly convex. We have $D(P_\theta\|P) = \theta\varphi'(\theta) - \varphi(\theta)$ and $H(P_\theta) = (1-\theta)\varphi'(\theta) + \varphi(\theta)$.

We also have $D(P_\theta\|P) - H(P_\theta) = (2\theta-1)\varphi'(\theta) - 2\varphi(\theta)$. Since $D(P_{\theta(r)}\|P) = r$, solving the relation $\theta(r)\varphi'(\theta(r)) - \varphi(\theta(r)) = r$, we have $D(P_{\theta(r)}\|P) - H(P_{\theta(r)}) = f(\theta(r))$ by using the function $f(\theta) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{(2\theta-1)r - \varphi(\theta)}{\theta}$.

The derivative of f is $f'(\theta) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \frac{\varphi(\theta)+r-\theta\varphi'(\theta)}{\theta^2}$. The derivative of the numerator is $-\theta\varphi''(\theta) < 0$ when $\frac{1}{2} \geq \theta > 0$. Hence, $\sup_{0\leq s\leq \frac{1}{2}} f(\theta)$ is realized when $f'(\theta) = 0$, which is equivalent to $\varphi(\theta)+r-\theta\varphi'(\theta) = 0$, i.e., $D(P_\theta\|P) = r$. This condition is equivalent to $\theta = \theta(r)$. Therefore, $\sup_{0\leq s\leq \frac{1}{2}} f(\theta) = f(\theta(r))$. That is, we have $D(P_{\theta(r)}\|P) - H(P_{\theta(r)}) = f(\theta(r)) = \sup_{0\leq s<1} f(\theta)$. Since $f(\theta) = \frac{-2s}{1-s}r - H_{\frac{1+s}{2}}(\Psi)$ with $1-\theta = \frac{1+s}{2}$, we obtain (123). ■

Lemma 5. *For $r < -H_1(\Psi)$, we have*

$$\min_{Q:D(Q\|P)\leq D(P_{\theta(r)}\|P)} D(Q\|P) - H(Q) = D(P_{\theta(r)}\|P) - H(P_{\theta(r)}). \tag{124}$$

In particular, (120) *holds*

Combining Lemma 4 and 5, we obtain Lemma 2.

Proof: Assume that for a distribution Q, there exists a parameter $\theta \in [0,1]$ such that $H(Q) = H(P_\theta)$. Then, we have $\frac{1}{1-\theta}D(Q\|P_\theta) = \frac{1}{1-\theta}\sum_x Q(x)\log Q(x) - \sum_x Q(x)\log P(x) - \frac{\varphi(\theta)}{1-\theta}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&D(Q\|P) - \frac{1}{1-\theta}D(Q\|P_\theta) \\
=&\sum_x Q(x)(\log Q(x) - \log P(x)) - \frac{1}{1-\theta}\sum_x Q(x)\log Q(x) + \sum_x Q(x)\log P(x) + \frac{\varphi(\theta)}{1-\theta} \\
=&-\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}\sum_x Q(x)\log Q(x) + \frac{\varphi(\theta)}{1-\theta} \\
=&-\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}H(Q) + \frac{\varphi(\theta)}{1-\theta} = \frac{\theta}{1-\theta}H(P_\theta) + \frac{\varphi(\theta)}{1-\theta} \\
=&-\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}\sum_x P_\theta(x)(1-\theta)\log P(x) - \frac{\theta}{1-\theta}\varphi(\theta) + \frac{\varphi(\theta)}{1-\theta} \\
=&-\theta\sum_x P_\theta(x)\log P(x) + \varphi(\theta) = D(P_\theta\|P).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{1}{1-\theta}D(Q\|P_\theta) \geq 0$, for $\theta \in [0,1]$, we have

$$\max_{Q:D(Q\|P)\leq D(P_\theta\|P)} H(Q) = H(P_\theta). \tag{125}$$

Hence,

$$\min_{Q:D(Q\|P)\leq D(P_{\theta(r)}\|P)} D(Q\|P) - H(Q) = D(P_{\theta(r)}\|P) - H(P_{\theta(r)}). \tag{126}$$

Now, we proceed to the proof of (120). (125) implies that

$$\min_{Q:H(Q)\geq H(P)} D(Q\|P) - H(Q) = \min_\theta D(P_\theta\|P) - H(P_\theta). \tag{127}$$

Since $\min_Q D(Q\|P) - H(Q) = \min_{Q:H(Q)\geq H(P)} D(Q\|P) - H(Q)$, we have

$$\min_Q D(Q\|P) - H(Q) = \min_\theta D(P_\theta\|P) - H(P_\theta). \tag{128}$$

In the proof of Lemma 4, we show that $D(P_\theta\|P) - H(P_\theta) = (2\theta-1)\varphi'(\theta) - 2\varphi(\theta)$ and $D(P_\theta\|P) - H(P_\theta)$ realizes the minimum at $\theta = 1/2$. Since $(1-1)\varphi'(1/2) - 2\varphi(1/2) = -H_{1/2}(\Psi)$, we obtain (120). ■

5.4. Stein-Strassen bound. Now, we give a two-round classical communication protocol to achieve the Stein-Strassen bound. For this purpose, we show the following lemma.

Lemma 6. *For a given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a collection of measures $\{m_k\}_{k=0}^{M_n}$ such that*

$$\log \sum_{j=1}^{M_n} |\{\boldsymbol{x}|m_j(\boldsymbol{x}) \neq 0\}| \frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P^n(\boldsymbol{x}) m_j(\boldsymbol{x})}{\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P^n(\boldsymbol{x}) m_j(\boldsymbol{x})^2} \tag{129}$$

$$\leq nH_1(\Psi) + \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon) - \log n + O(1), \tag{130}$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{M_n} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P^n(\boldsymbol{x}) m_j(\boldsymbol{x}) = \epsilon + o(1). \tag{131}$$

Now, we are ready to mention the main theorem of this subsection. Applying Proposition 6 to the collection of measures given in Lemma 6, we have the following theorem by using $\epsilon' = 1 - \epsilon$.

Theorem 6. *There is a collection $\{m_{n,\omega}\}_\omega$ of non-negative measures on $\mathcal{X}^n$ such that*

$$\log \beta(T[\{m_{n,\omega}\}_\omega]) \leq -n(\log d_A d_B - H_1(\Psi)) - \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon') - \log n + O(1), \tag{132}$$

$$\alpha(T[\{m_{n,\omega}\}_\omega]) \to \epsilon'. \tag{133}$$

In subsection 4.2, we have already shown that $\beta_{n,sep}(\epsilon'|\Psi\|\rho_{mix})$ can be given by (25). Hence, $\beta_{n,\leftrightarrow}(\epsilon'|\Psi\|\rho_{mix}) \geq -n(\log d_A d_B - H_1(\Psi)) - \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon') - \log n + O(1)$. Theorem 6 guarantees the opposite inequality. Hence, we obtain the remaining part of (25).

Construction of a collection of measures: Now, to show Lemma 6, we construct a collection of measures $\{m_k\}_{k=0}^{M_n}$ as follows. For this purpose, when $\log P(x) - \log P(x')$ is a lattice variable, we define the real number c to be the lattice span d. When $\log P(x) - \log P(x')$ is a non-lattice variable, we define the real number c to be an arbitrary positive real number. For the definitions of lattice and non-lattice variables and the lattice span d, see Appendix A. We fix $a, b > 0$ such that $c > a$.

Then, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 7. *The function $f(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{s\geq 0} -sH_{1+s}(\Psi) + (1+s)(H_1(\Psi) - ct) - (H_1(\Psi) - b - at)$ monotonically decreases for $t > 0$, and there uniquely exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $f(t_0) = 0$.*

Proof: Since $f(t) = b + \min_{s\geq 0} s(H_1(\Psi) - H_{1+s}(\Psi)) - (sc + c - a)t$ and $sc + c - a > 0$, $f(t)$ is strictly monotonically decreasing for $t > 0$.

Since $H_1(\Psi) - H_{1+s}(\Psi) \geq 0$ with $s \geq 0$ and its equality holds only with $s = 0$, we have $f(0) = b + \min_{s\geq 0} s(H_1(\Psi) - H_{1+s}(\Psi)) = b > 0$. On the other hand, for a fixed $s \geq 0$, $b + s(H_1(\Psi) - H_{1+s}(\Psi)) - (sc + c - a)t$ goes to $-\infty$ when t goes to the infinity. Hence, $f(t)$ goes to $-\infty$ when t goes to infinity. Thus, there uniquely exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $f(t_0) = 0$. ■

Then, we fix $t \in (0, t_0)$, and define

$$\mathcal{R}_{k,n} \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \left\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n \left| \begin{array}{l} nH_1(\Psi) + \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon) - ck \ge -\log P^n(\boldsymbol{x}) \\ > nH_1(\Psi) + \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon) - c(k+1) \end{array} \right. \right\}, \quad (134)$$

and

$$M_n \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \lfloor e^{nb} \rfloor, \ N_n \stackrel{\rm def}{=} |\mathcal{R}_{0,n}| M_n^{-1}, \ N_{k,n} \stackrel{\rm def}{=} N_n e^{-ka}. \quad (135)$$

For $k \le tn$, we define M_n subsets $\mathcal{R}_{k,n,1}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}_{k,n,M_n}$ of $\mathcal{R}_{k,n}$, whose cardinalities are $N_{k,n}$. We define the measure m_j $(j = 1, \ldots, M_n)$ as the measure satisfying the following two conditions. The support of m_j is $\mathcal{S}_{j,n} \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \cup_{k=0}^{tn} \mathcal{R}_{k,n,j}$. For $\boldsymbol{x} \in \cup_{k=0}^{tn} \mathcal{R}_{k,n}$, the relation $\sum_{j=1}^{M_n} m_j(\boldsymbol{x}) = 1$ holds.

Proofs of (130) and (131): For proofs of (130) and (131), we prepare the following lemma.

Lemma 8.

$$\log |\mathcal{R}_{0,n}| = nH_1(\Psi) + \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon) - \frac{1}{2}\log n + O(1). \quad (136)$$

$$\log \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\mathcal{R}_{k,n}| e^{ka} = nH_1(\Psi) + \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon) - \frac{1}{2}\log n + O(1) \quad (137)$$

$$\log \max_{k=0,\ldots,tn} P^n(\mathcal{R}_{k,n}) = -\frac{1}{2}\log n + O(1), \quad (138)$$

and

$$P^n \left\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n \left| nH_1(\Psi) + \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon) < -\log P^n(\boldsymbol{x}) \right. \right\} \to \epsilon. \quad (139)$$

Proof: Define

$$v(\boldsymbol{x}) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} (\log P^n(\boldsymbol{x}) + nH_1(\Psi) + \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))/\sqrt{n}$$
$$Q_n(v) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}: v(\boldsymbol{x}) = v} P^n(\boldsymbol{x}).$$

Then, we have

$$|\{\boldsymbol{x} | a \le v(\boldsymbol{x}) \le b\}| = e^{nH_1(\Psi) + \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon)} \sum_{v: a \le v \le b} e^{-\sqrt{n}v} Q_n(v). \quad (140)$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\mathcal{R}_{k,n}| e^{ka} =& e^{nH_1(\Psi) + \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon)} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{v: \frac{ck}{\sqrt{n}} \le v \le \frac{c(k+1)}{\sqrt{n}}} e^{-\sqrt{n}v + ka} Q_n(v) \\ \le& e^{nH_1(\Psi) + \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon)} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{v: \frac{ck}{\sqrt{n}} \le v \le \frac{c(k+1)}{\sqrt{n}}} e^{-\sqrt{n}v + \sqrt{n}av/c} Q_n(v) \\ \le& e^{nH_1(\Psi) + \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon)} \sum_{v: v \ge 0} e^{-\sqrt{n}(1 - \frac{a}{c})v} Q_n(v). \end{aligned} \quad (141)$$

Similarly, we can show that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\mathcal{R}_{k,n}| e^{ka} \ge e^{nH_1(\Psi)+\sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon)} \sum_{v:v\ge 0} e^{-\sqrt{n}(1-\frac{a}{c})v-a} Q_n(v). \tag{142}$$

Define the distribution function

$$F_{n,c}(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P^n\{\boldsymbol{x}|v(\boldsymbol{x}) \le t\}. \tag{143}$$

In the following, we consider the non-lattice case. Now, we employ the saddle point approximation method given in [62, Theorem 2.3.6],[61]. As is known as Cramér-Esséen theorem [39, p. 538], there exist a constant S and a function c_n such that

$$F_{n,c}(t-\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon)) = \Phi(t) - \frac{S}{6\sqrt{n}}(1-t^2)\frac{e^{-t^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} + \frac{c_n(t)}{\sqrt{n}}. \tag{144}$$

and $|c_n(t)| \to 0$, which is uniformly convergent on compact sets. Thus, we obtain (139).

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{n}\left| \sum_{v:c(k+1)/\sqrt{n}>v\ge ck/\sqrt{n}} Q_n(v) - \int_{ck/\sqrt{n}}^{c(k+1)/\sqrt{n}} \frac{e^{-\frac{(v+\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))^2}{2V(\Psi)}}}{\sqrt{2\pi V(\Psi)}} dv \right| \\
\le& \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{n}\Big(\int_{ck/\sqrt{n}}^{c(k+1)/\sqrt{n}} \frac{d}{dt}\Big(\frac{S}{6\sqrt{n}}(1-(t+\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))^2)\frac{e^{-(t+\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\Big)dt \\
&+ \frac{c_n(c/\sqrt{n})-c_n(0)}{\sqrt{n}}\Big) \\
=& \lim_{n\to\infty} \Big[\frac{S}{6}(1-(t+\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))^2)\frac{e^{-(t+\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\Big]_{\frac{ck}{\sqrt{n}}}^{\frac{c(k+1)}{\sqrt{n}}} + c_n(c/\sqrt{n}) - c_n(0) \\
=&0,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{n}\left| \sum_{v:v\ge 0} e^{-\sqrt{n}(1-\frac{a}{c})v} Q_n(v) - \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\sqrt{n}(1-\frac{a}{c})v} \frac{e^{-\frac{(v+\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))^2}{2V(\Psi)}}}{\sqrt{2\pi V(\Psi)}} dv \right| \\
\le& \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{n} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\sqrt{n}(1-\frac{a}{c})t} \frac{d}{dt}\Big(\frac{S}{6\sqrt{n}}(1-(t+\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))^2)\frac{e^{-(t+\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\Big)dt \\
&+ \inf_a \Big(2\sup_{v\le a} e^{-\sqrt{n}(1-\frac{a}{c})v} \sup_{t\le a} \frac{|c_n(t)|}{\sqrt{n}} + 2\sup_{v>a} e^{-\sqrt{n}(1-\frac{a}{c})v} \sup_{t>a} \frac{|c_n(t)|}{\sqrt{n}}\Big) \\
=& \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\sqrt{n}(1-\frac{a}{c})t} \frac{d}{dt}\Big(\frac{S}{6}(1-(t+\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))^2)\frac{e^{-(t+\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\Big)dt \\
&+ \inf_a \Big(2\sup_{v\le a} e^{-\sqrt{n}(1-\frac{a}{c})v} \sup_{t\le a} |c_n(t)| + 2\sup_{v>a} e^{-\sqrt{n}(1-\frac{a}{c})v} \sup_{t>a} |c_n(t)|\Big) \\
=&0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, when tn satisfies $v_0 = ctn/\sqrt{n}$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{n} P^n(\mathcal{R}_{tn,n}) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{n} \sum_{v: c(tn+1)/\sqrt{n} > v \ge ctn/\sqrt{n}} Q_n(v)$$
$$= \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{n} \int_{ctn/\sqrt{n}}^{c(tn+1)/\sqrt{n}} \frac{e^{-\frac{(v+\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))^2}{2V(\Psi)}}}{\sqrt{2\pi V(\Psi)}} dv = c \frac{e^{-\frac{(v_0+\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))^2}{2V(\Psi)}}}{\sqrt{2\pi V(\Psi)}}, \tag{145}$$

which implies (138). Further,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{n} \sum_{v: v\ge 0} e^{-\sqrt{n}(1-\frac{a}{c})v} Q_n(v) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{n} \int_0^\infty e^{-\sqrt{n}(1-\frac{a}{c})v} \frac{e^{-\frac{(v+\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))^2}{2V(\Psi)}}}{\sqrt{2\pi V(\Psi)}} dv$$
$$= \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{n} \int_0^\infty e^{-(1-\frac{a}{c})x} \frac{e^{-\frac{(x/\sqrt{n}+\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))^2}{2V(\Psi)}}}{\sqrt{2\pi V(\Psi) n}} dx$$
$$= \int_0^\infty e^{-(1-\frac{a}{c})x} \frac{e^{-\frac{\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon)^2}{2V(\Psi)}}}{\sqrt{2\pi V(\Psi)}} dx = \frac{1}{1-\frac{a}{c}} \frac{e^{-\frac{\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon)^2}{2V(\Psi)}}}{\sqrt{2\pi V(\Psi)}}. \tag{146}$$

Therefore, the combination of (140) and (145) yields (136), and the combination of (141), (142) and (146) yields (137).

Now, we consider the lattice case. The range of the map v is contained in $\{a_n + \frac{ck}{\sqrt{n}}\}_k$ by choosing a suitable real number a_n with $|a_n| \le \frac{c}{2\sqrt{n}}$. Then, we define the set $\mathcal{T}_n \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \{a_n + \frac{ck}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{c}{2\sqrt{n}}\}_k$. Then, (144) holds for $t \in \mathcal{T}_n$ [40, pp. 52-67][39, p. 540]. Hence, similar to (145) and (146), we can show

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{n} \sum_{v: a_n + \frac{c(k+1)}{\sqrt{n}} \ge v \ge a_n + \frac{ck}{\sqrt{n}}} Q_n(v)$$
$$= \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{n} \int_{a_n+\frac{ck}{\sqrt{n}}}^{a_n+\frac{c(k+1)}{\sqrt{n}}} \frac{e^{-\frac{(v+\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))^2}{2V(\Psi)}}}{\sqrt{2\pi V(\Psi)}} dv = c \frac{e^{-\frac{(v_0+\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))^2}{2V(\Psi)}}}{\sqrt{2\pi V(\Psi)}}, \tag{147}$$

with $v_0 = k/\sqrt{n}$, and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{n} \sum_{v: v\ge a_n} e^{-\sqrt{n}(1-\frac{a}{c})v} Q_n(v) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{n} \int_{a_n}^\infty e^{-\sqrt{n}(1-\frac{a}{c})v} \frac{e^{-\frac{(v+\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))^2}{2V(\Psi)}}}{\sqrt{2\pi V(\Psi)}} dv$$
$$= \frac{1}{1-\frac{a}{c}} \frac{e^{-\frac{\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon)^2}{2V(\Psi)}}}{\sqrt{2\pi V(\Psi)}}. \tag{148}$$

Hence, (147) implies (138). Further, the combination of (140) and (147) yields (136), and the combination of (141), (142) and (148) does (137). ■

Using Lemma 8, we can show the following lemma.

Lemma 9. *There exist an integer N and a real number C such that any integer $n \ge N$ satisfies the following conditions. The inequalities*

$$N_{k,n} \le |\mathcal{R}_{k,n}| \text{ for } k \le tn, \tag{149}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\log \sum_{j=1}^{M_n} |\{\boldsymbol{x} | m_j(\boldsymbol{x}) \neq 0\}| \frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P^n(\boldsymbol{x}) m_j(\boldsymbol{x})}{\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P^n(\boldsymbol{x}) m_j(\boldsymbol{x})^2} \\
=& \log \sum_{j=1}^{M_n} (\sum_{k=0}^{tn} N_{k,n}) \frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P^n(\boldsymbol{x}) m_j(\boldsymbol{x})}{\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P^n(\boldsymbol{x}) m_j(\boldsymbol{x})^2} \\
\le& nH_1(\Psi) + \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon) - \log n + C,
\end{aligned} \tag{150}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&P^n\left\{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n \,\middle|\, nH_1(\Psi) + \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon) - ctn \ge -\log P^n(\boldsymbol{x})\right\} \\
\le& \min_{s\ge 0} e^{sn(-H_{1+s}(\Psi)+H_1(\Psi)-ct+\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon))}
\end{aligned} \tag{151}$$

hold.

Therefore, we obtain (130) and (131) of Lemma 6 from (139), (150), and (151) because the right hand side of (151) goes to zero.

Proof: Markov inequality implies (151) in the same way as [31, (2.121)].

Cramér Theorem implies that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{R}_{t'n,n}| = \min_{s\ge 0} -sH_{1+s}(\Psi) + (1+s)(H_1(\Psi) - ct'). \tag{152}$$

As shown in Lemma 8, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{R}_{0,n}| = H_1(\Psi). \tag{153}$$

Hence, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{t'n,n}|}{N_{t'n,n}} = f(t') > 0 \tag{154}$$

for $t' < t$. Hence, when n is sufficiently large, we have (149).

Next, we proceed to the proof of (150). From the above discussion, for $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{R}_{k,n}$ and $k \le tn$, the relation $\lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{N_{k,n}} \rfloor / M_n \le m_j(\boldsymbol{x}) \le \lceil \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{N_{k,n}} \rceil / M_n$ holds. Then, for $j = 1, \ldots, M_n$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2e^c} \sum_{k=0}^{tn} P^n(\mathcal{R}_{k,n})/M_n \le \sum_{k=0}^{tn} N_{k,n} e^{-(nH_1(\Psi)+\sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon)+c(k+1))} \lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{N_{k,n}} \rfloor / M_n \\
\le& \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P^n(\boldsymbol{x}) m_j(\boldsymbol{x}) \\
\le& \sum_{k=0}^{tn} N_{k,n} e^{-(nH_1(\Psi)+\sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon)+ck)} \lceil \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{N_{k,n}} \rceil / M_n \le 2e^c \sum_{k=0}^{tn} P^n(\mathcal{R}_{k,n})/M_n
\end{aligned} \tag{155}$$

because $\frac{1}{2}\frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{N_{k,n}} \le \lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{N_{k,n}} \rfloor$ and $\lceil \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{N_{k,n}} \rceil \le 2\frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{N_{k,n}}$.

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{4e^c}\sum_{k=0}^{tn} P^n(\mathcal{R}_{k,n})\frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{N_{k,n}M_n^2} \\
\le&\sum_{k=0}^{tn} N_{k,n} e^{-(nH_1(\Psi)+\sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon)+c(k+1))} \lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{N_{k,n}} \rfloor^2/M_n^2 \\
\le&\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P^n(\boldsymbol{x}) m_j(\boldsymbol{x})^2 \\
\le&\sum_{k=0}^{tn} N_{k,n} e^{-(nH_1(\Psi)+\sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon)+ck)} \lceil \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{N_{k,n}} \rceil^2/M_n^2 \\
\le&4e^c\sum_{k=0}^{tn} P^n(\mathcal{R}_{k,n})\frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{N_{k,n}M_n^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{156}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\sum_{k=0}^{tn} N_{k,n})\frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P^n(\boldsymbol{x})m_j(\boldsymbol{x})}{\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P^n(\boldsymbol{x})m_j(\boldsymbol{x})^2} \le (\sum_{k=0}^{tn} N_n e^{-ka})\frac{4e^c\sum_{k=0}^{tn} P^n(\mathcal{R}_{k,n})\frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{N_{k,n}M_n^2}}{\frac{1}{2e^c}\sum_{k=0}^{tn} P^n(\mathcal{R}_{k,n})/M_n} \\
\le&\frac{8e^{2c}}{1-e^{-a}}\cdot N_n\cdot\frac{\sum_{k=0}^{tn} P^n(\mathcal{R}_{k,n})\frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{N_{k,n}M_n}}{P^n(\cup_{k=0}^{tn}\mathcal{R}_{k,n})} \\
=&\frac{8e^{2c}}{1-e^{-a}}\cdot N_n\cdot\frac{\sum_{k=0}^{tn} P^n(\mathcal{R}_{k,n})\frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{|\mathcal{R}_{0,n}|}e^{ka}}{P^n(\cup_{k=0}^{tn}\mathcal{R}_{k,n})} \\
\le&\frac{8e^{2c}}{1-e^{-a}}\cdot N_n\cdot\frac{\max_{k=0}^{tn} P^n(\mathcal{R}_{k,n})\sum_{k=0}^{tn}\frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{|\mathcal{R}_{0,n}|}e^{ka}}{P^n(\cup_{k=0}^{tn}\mathcal{R}_{k,n})}.
\end{aligned} \tag{157}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=1}^{M_n}(\sum_{k=0}^{tn} N_{k,n})\frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P^n(\boldsymbol{x})m_j(\boldsymbol{x})}{\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P^n(\boldsymbol{x})m_j(\boldsymbol{x})^2} \\
\le&M_n\frac{8e^{2c}}{1-e^{-a}}\cdot N_n\cdot\frac{\max_{k=0}^{tn} P^n(\mathcal{R}_{k,n})\sum_{k=0}^{tn}\frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{|\mathcal{R}_{0,n}|}e^{ka}}{P^n(\cup_{k=0}^{tn}\mathcal{R}_{k,n})} \\
=&\frac{8e^{2c}}{1-e^{-a}}\cdot|\mathcal{R}_{0,n}|\cdot\frac{\max_{k=0}^{tn} P^n(\mathcal{R}_{k,n})\sum_{k=0}^{tn}\frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{|\mathcal{R}_{0,n}|}e^{ka}}{P^n(\cup_{k=0}^{tn}\mathcal{R}_{k,n})}.
\end{aligned} \tag{158}$$

Thus, since (136) and (137) of Lemma 8 guarantees that

$$\log\sum_{k=0}^{tn}\frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}|}{|\mathcal{R}_{0,n}|}e^{ka} = O(1), \tag{159}$$

(136) and (138) of Lemma 8 and (158) imply

$$\begin{aligned}&\log \sum_{j=1}^{M_n} (\sum_{k=0}^{tn} N_{k,n}) \frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P^n(\boldsymbol{x}) m_j(\boldsymbol{x})}{\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P^n(\boldsymbol{x}) m_j(\boldsymbol{x})^2} \\ =& nH_1(\Psi) + \sqrt{n}\sqrt{V(\Psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon) - \frac{1}{2}\log n - \frac{1}{2}\log n + O(1). \end{aligned} \tag{160}$$

Hence, we obtain (150). ■

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we have treated local asymptotic hypothesis testing between an arbitrary known bipartite pure state $|\Psi\rangle$ and the completely mixed state ρ_{mix}. As a result, we have clarified the difference between the optimal performance of one-way and two-way LOCC POVMs. Under the exponential constraint for the type-1 error probability, there clearly exists a difference between the optimal exponential decreasing rates of the type-2 error probabilities under one-way and two-way LOCC POVMs. However, when we surpass the constraint for the type-1 error probability, this kind of difference is very subtle. That is, there exists a difference only in the third order for the optimal exponential decreasing rates of the type-2 error probabilities under one-way and two-way LOCC POVMs. This difference has been given as Theorem 1, which is called Stein-Strassen bound.

From the beginning of the study of LOCC, many studies have focused on the effect of increasing the number of communication rounds, as well as the difference between two-way LOCC and separable operations. In this viewpoint, our study gives a very rare example in which the optimal performance under the infinite-round two-way LOCC, which is different from the one under the one-way LOCC, can be attained with two-round communication and is also equal to the one under separable operations. To show the achievability by two-round communication, we employ the saddle point approximation method given in [62, Theorem 2.3.6],[61]. To show the impossibility to surpass this performance even in the separable operation, we use the strong large deviation by Bahadur-Rao [63][62, Theorem 3.7.4]. We believe that these methods will become a very strong approach for addressing several topics in quantum information.

Acknowledgement

MH is grateful to Dr. Vincent Tan for explaining the strong large deviation for the lattice case. This research was partially supported by the MEXT Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (A) No. 23246071. The Center for Quantum Technologies is funded by the Singapore Ministry of Education and the National Research Foundation as part of the Research Centres of Excellence programme.

A. Strong large deviation

Let p be a non-negative measure and d be the lattice span of the real valued function X, which is defined as follows. Let S be the set of the support of the

measure $p \circ X^{-1}$. When there exists a non-negative value x satisfying $\{a - b\}_{a,b \in S} \subset x\mathbb{Z}$, the real valued function X is called a lattice function or a lattice variable. Then, the lattice span d is defined as the maximum value of the above non-negative value x. When there does not exists such a non-negative value x, the real valued function X is called a non-lattice function or a non-lattice variable. Then, the lattice span d is regarded as zero.

Here p is not necessarily normalized. Define the notation $E_p[X] \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \int X(\omega) p(d\omega)$. Define the cumulant generating function $\tau(s) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \log E_p[e^{sX}]$. Denote the inverse function of the derivative $\tau'(s)$ by η.

Proposition 7 (Bahadur and Rao [63], Theorem 3.7.4 of [62]). *Assume that $\tau(0) < \infty$. When $R > \frac{E_p[X]}{E_p[1]}$, we have*

$$\log p^n\{X_n \ge nR\} = \chi_0(R)n - \frac{1}{2}\log n + \chi_1(R) + \chi_2(R)\frac{1}{n} + o(1) \tag{161}$$

$$\log p^n\{X_n \le nR\} = n\tau(0) + o(1), \tag{162}$$

where

$$\chi_0(R) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} -R\eta(R) + \tau(\eta(R)) \tag{163}$$

$$\chi_1(R) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2}\log 2\pi - \log \eta(R) + \frac{1}{2}\eta'(R) & \text{if } d = 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}\log 2\pi + \frac{1}{2}\eta'(R) + \log \frac{d}{1-e^{-d\eta(R)}} & \text{if } d > 0, \end{cases} \tag{164}$$

and $\chi_2(R)$ is a continuous function. When $R < \frac{E_p[X]}{E_p[1]}$, we have

$$\log p^n\{X_n \ge nR\} = n\tau(0) + o(1) \tag{165}$$

$$\log p^n\{X_n \le nR\} = \chi_0(R)n - \frac{1}{2}\log n + \chi_1(R) + \chi_2(R)\frac{1}{n} + o(1). \tag{166}$$

References

1. A. Peres and W.K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 1119, (1991).
2. S. Massar and S. Popescu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 1259 (1995)
3. C.H. Bennett, D.P. DiVincenzo, C.A. Fuchs, T. Mor, E. Rains, P.W. Shor, J.A. Smolin, and W.K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. A*, **59**, 1070, (1999).
4. J. Walgate, A. J. Short, L. Hardy, and V. Vedral, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **85**, 4972, (2000).
5. B. Groisman, L. Vaidman, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, **34** 6881 (2001).
6. S. Virmani, M.F. Sacchi, M.B. Plenio, and D. Markham, *Phys. Lett. A*, **288**, 62, (2001).
7. S. Ghosh, G. Kar, A. Roy, A. Sen(De), and U. Sen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **87**, 277902, (2001).
8. B.M. Terhal, D.P. DiVincenzo, and D.W. Leung, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **86**, 5807, (2001).
9. J. Watrous, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **95**, 080505, (2005).
10. M. Hayashi, D. Markham, M. Murao, M. Owari, and S. Virmani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **96**, 040501, (2006).
11. M. Hayashi, K. Matsumoto, Y. Tsuda, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, **39**,14427, (2006).
12. M. Owari and M. Hayashi, *Phys. Rev. A*, **74**, 032108 (2006).
13. M. Koashi, F. Takenaga, T. Yamamoto, N. Imoto, arXiv:0709.3196 (2007)
14. S.M. Cohen *Phys. Rev. A*, **75** 052313, (2007).
15. M. Owari, and M. Hayashi, *New J. of Phys.*, **10**, 013006, (2008).
16. Y. Ishida, T. Hashimoto, M. Horibe, and A. Hayashi, *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 012309, (2008).
17. W. Matthews and A. Winter, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **285**, 161, (2009).
18. R. Duan, Y. Feng, Y. Xin, M. Ying, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory,* **55**, 1320, (2009).
19. M. Hayashi, *New J. Phys.*, **11**, 043028, (2009).

20. W. Jiang, X.-J. Ren, X. Zhou, Z.-W. Zhou, and G.-C. Guo *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 032330, (2009).
21. J. Calsamiglia, J. I. de Vicente, R. Muñoz-Tapia, and E. Bagan *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **105**, 080504 (2010)
22. W. Jiang, X.-J. Ren, Y.-C. Wu, Z.-W. Zhou, G.-C. Guo and H. Fan *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **43**, 325303, (2010)
23. S. Bandyopadhyay, *Phys. Rev. A*, **81**, 022327 (2010).
24. M. Nathanson, *J. Math. Phys.* **51**, 042102, (2010).
25. M. Kleinmann, H. Kampermann, and D. Bruß, *Phys. Rev. A*, **84**, 042326 (2011).
26. K. Li, A. Winter, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **326** (1) 63-80 (2014)
27. E. Chitambar and M.-H. Hsieh, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 020302(R) (2013)
28. A. M. Childs, D. Leung, L. Mancinska, M. Ozols, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **323**, 1121 (2013)
29. H. Fu, D. Leung, L. Mancinska, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 052310 (2014)
30. F.G.S.L. Brandao, A.W. Harrow, J.R. Lee, Y. Peres, *Proc. of 5th ITCS*, pp. 183-194 (2014)
31. M. Hayashi, *Quantum Information: An Introduction*, Springer-Verlag, (2006)
32. T.-S. Han, *Information-Spectrum Method in Information Theory*, Springer-Verlag, (2002)
33. K.M.R. Audenaert, J. Calsamiglia, R. Muñoz-Tapia, E. Bagan, Ll. Masanes, A. Acin, F. Verstraete, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 160501 (2007).
34. M. Hayashi *Phys. Rev. A*, **76**, 062301 (2007)
35. K.M.R. Audenaert, M. Nussbaum, A. Szkola, F. Verstraete, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 279, 251-283 (2008)
36. M. Owari, M. Hayashi, arXiv:1006.2744 (2010)
37. H. Chernoff, *Ann. Math. Stat.* **23**, 493 (1952)
38. M. Owari and M. Hayashi, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 032327 (2014); arXiv:1105.3789 (2011).
39. W. Feller, An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications, Vol. II, Wiley, NY, 1971.
40. C.-G. Esséen, "Fourier analysis of distribution functions," Acta Mathematica, Vol. 77, pp. 1-125, 1945
41. V. Strassen, "Asymptotische Abschätzungen in Shannon's Informationstheorie," *Trans. Third Prague Conf. Information Theory*, 1962. English translation by M. Luthy available from http://www.math.cornell.edu/p̃mlut/strassen.pdf.
42. H. Nagaoka "The Converse Part of The Theorem for Quantum Hoeffding Bound," arXiv:quant-ph/0611289
43. M. Nussbaum, and A. Szkoła, "The Chernoff lower bound for symmetric quantum hypothesis testing," *Annals of Statistics*, Vol. 37, No. 2, 1040-1057, 2009.
44. W. Hoeffding, "Asymptotically Optimal Tests for Multinomial Distributions", *Ann. Math. Statist.* **36**, 369-401 (1965)
45. K. Li, "Second Order Asymptotics for Quantum Hypothesis Testing," *Annals of Statistics* Vol. 42, No. 1, 171-189 (2014).
46. M. Tomamichel and M. Hayashi, "A Hierarchy of Information Quantities for Finite Block Length Analysis of Quantum Tasks," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, No. 11, 7693-7710 (2013).
47. I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information theory: Coding Theorem for Discrete Memoryless systems*, Academic Press, New York, (1981)
48. T. Ogawa, and H. Nagaoka, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol.46, no. 7, pp. 2428-2433, (2000).
49. R.E. Blahut, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, **60**, 405 (1974)
50. I. Csiszár, G. Longo, *Studia Sci. Math. Hungarica* **6**, 181 (1971)
51. F. Hiai and D. Petz, *Commun. Math. Phys.*, vol.143, 99, (1991).
52. E. Chitambar, D. Leung, L. Mancinska, M. Ozols, A. Winter, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, vol. 328, no. 1, pp. 303-326 (2014).
53. M. Owari, S.L. Braunstein, K. Nemoto, M. Murao, *Quant. Inf. Comp.*, **8**, 0030, (2008).
54. E. Chitambar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 190502 (2011)
55. E. Chitambar, W. Cui, and H.-K. Lo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** 240504 (2012).
56. S. Virmani and M.B. Plenio, *Quant. Inf. Comp.* **7**, 1, (2007).
57. R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, K. Horodecki, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865, (2009).
58. F.G.S.L. Brandao, *Phys. Rev. A*, **72**, 022310 (2005).
59. M. Hayashi, D. Markham, M. Murao, M. Owari, and S. Virmani, *Phys. Rev. A*, **77**, 012104 (2008).
60. N. Datta, *Int. J.Quant. Inf.* **7**, 475 (2009).
61. P. Moulin, "The Log-Volume of Optimal Codes for Memoryless Channels, Within A Few Nats," arXiv:1311.0181 (2013)

62. A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni, *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*, Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability. Springer, 2 edition, 1998.
63. R. R. Bahadur and R. Ranga Rao, "On deviations of the sample mean," *Ann. Math. Statis.*, **31** 1015-1027 (1960).